ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

Lyon v.1
1868889
History of St.Andrews
STORAGE

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

S70

ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/historyofstandre0001revc

HISTORY

OF

ST ANDREWS,

EPISCOPAL, MONASTIC, ACADEMIC, AND CIVIL;

COMPRISING THE PRINCIPAL PART OF THE

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF SCOTLAND,

FROM THE EARLIEST AGE TILL THE PRESENT TIME.

BY THE REV. C. J. LYON, M.A.,

FORMERLY OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

AND NOW PRESBYTER OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH, ST ANDREWS.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.

V.1

WILLIAM TAIT, EDINBURGH;

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO., LONDON;

AND JOHN CUMMING, DUBLIN.

MDCCCXLIII.

1868889

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

THE PRIMUS AND BISHOPS

OF THE

REFORMED CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SCOTLAND;

THIS WORK,

CONTAINING AN ACCOUNT OF THE LIVES AND TIMES OF SOME OF

THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS OF THEIR PREDECESSORS,

IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY THEIR MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT AND HUMBLE PRESBYTER,

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

Some account of the ancient Metropolitan See of St Andrews,—once the Canterbury of Scotland—the seat of its oldest University—the nursery of the Reformation—and the scene of many memorable occurrences,—may be thought deserving of attention in this age of general inquiry.

By nothing was St Andrews so much distinguished, from the ninth to the seventeenth century, as by its long line of Bishops and Archbishops, among whom the sons and grandsons of our Scottish kings did not disdain to rank themselves. To an historical and biographical account of these Prelates, I have devoted a large, and I hope not an uninteresting, portion of this work; which will be found to include, at the same time, the principal events in the ecclesiastical annals of our country.

The history of St Andrews goes back to very early times, independent of the well-known tradition as to St Regulus and his followers. Here it was that, according to the venerable Wyntoun, Hungus king of the Picts, in gratitude for the supposed assistance he had received from St Andrew, richly endowed the ancient Culdean church of this place;

"Then furth in his devotioune,
Added the dotatioune
Of Sanct Andrewys kyrk in fee,
And landis in regality."

Here Alexander I., with the singular ceremony of leading

"His comely steed of Araby,
Saddled and brydled costlyly,"

up to the altar of the "auld kyrk" of St Rule, endowed the same Church with the celebrated *Cursus Apri* or "Boaris chace;" which valuable endowment was confirmed by his brother and successor, the saintly David, when

"Of Sanct Andrewys the city til
He came, and hys son the earl Henry,
And with them lords richt mony,"

for the purpose of inspecting the newly-begun Priory of Saint Augustine, and having an interview with Bishop Robert, its principal founder. And here, in the same kirk of St Rule, Malcolm, "the Maiden King," honoured with his presence the consecration of Arnold, the nineteenth Bishop of St Andrews, which was performed by the Bishop of Moray, legate of Pope Alexander III.

The same king presided, not many months after, at the foundation of the Cathedral church:—

"Malcolme at that foundatioune
Was present in hys awn persoune;"

and, one hundred and fifty-eight years after, it was solemnly dedicated, in the presence of Robert the Bruce,—

"The kyng Robert honourably
Was there in persoune bodyly;
And seven byshopis were seen,
And abbotis also were there fifteen,

And mony other gret gentilmen
Were gadryd to that assembly then."

The same stately edifice witnessed the marriage of the fifth James to the mother of our much-injured Mary,—it saw within its walls most of the contemporary kings, nobility, and mitred prelates of Scotland,—and its sacred precincts still contain the ashes of some of the most distinguished primates, governors, and chancellors of the kingdom; whose monuments indeed the fury of an ultra-reformation has swept away, but whose dust is still incorporated with the consecrated soil. Over the misguided zeal which, under the name of Reformation, destroyed so many sacred edifices in this country, all right-thinking persons must mourn; and particularly must we lament the destruction of our once-magnificent metropolitan Cathedral, on which vast expense, consummate skill, and many years of assiduous labour, had been bestowed.

But not to dwell here on circumstances which will be detailed in their proper places, I shall only remark, that what we have chiefly to do in the present times, is to revive, as far as possible, the memory of what is gone; and, in reviewing the conduct of our ancestors, to derive all the benefit in our power, both from their errors and their virtues: for, unless we do this, it is only a waste of time to investigate their history. Especially should we learn to imitate their piety, zeal, and munificence, without adopting their superstition and intolerance; and, in particular, should the nobility and gentry of Scotland take example from the instances which will be quoted, of the religious liberality of their predecessors in the middle ages, to be

less sparing in their contributions to the impoverished Reformed Catholic Church in Scotland, of which most of them are members,—and which they are the more bound to uphold, from the well-known fact, that not a few of them are enriched by its spoils.

The middle ages in the history of Great Britain are termed "the dark ages;" but I apprehend they are only dark *to us*, from the imperfect records which have been transmitted to us of their real state and character. It seems to me, that the more we discover concerning those ages, the more brilliantly do they shine, and the greater excellencies do they unfold. The present work will, it is believed, confirm this impression, as it respects Scotland; and thus lead us to judge more favourably of our forefathers than we have been accustomed to do, especially when we compare them and their opinions with the men and the opinions of the distempered age in which we live—an age, I will venture to affirm, as much in need of a true Reformation as any that ever preceded it. We might learn many a useful lesson from our forefathers, if our self-conceit would permit us to seek instruction at their hands; for, if we excel them in arts, sciences, and civilisation, it must be allowed that they surpassed us in the more valuable qualities of self-denial, disinterestedness, and devotion—in religious munificence, and generous hospitality.

To make the records of the middle ages more accessible to the generality of readers, I have translated, from the Latin originals, those of them that had reference to the subject of this work. I may venture to say, that the following documents connected with the

Bishoprick, Priory, and University of St Andrews,—numerous bulls of the Popes—the correspondence between Edward III. and John XXII.—various safe-conducts to pass into England and foreign parts—the proofs of our King Alexander III.'s designs against the property of this see, not hitherto noticed by historians—the charters and statutes of the Colleges—the register of our once-celebrated priory, which has only recently come to light, and, connected with it, the supplementary Dennylne Papers preserved in the Advocates' Library—letters from the Epistolæ Regum Scotorum—and, lastly, Archbishop Sharp's presentation-charter to his diocese, (not to mention some other papers of minor importance,)—have either never before been printed, or never till now appeared in an English dress.

I have availed myself, as was my duty, of the labours of the older as well as the more recent historians of Scotland; and, in doing so, have generally preferred extracting their own words, to giving the substance of them in mine. The advantage of this is, that it not only prevents any unconscious colouring or exaggeration on my part, but also more effectually conveys the reader back, in imagination, to the times described, and brings the scenes delineated more immediately before his eyes. This may, indeed, be thought by some to detract from an author's praise, by saving him the labour of condensation; but this is a species of detraction I am very willing to endure, if the plan I have adopted be found to contribute, as I have no doubt it will, to the satisfaction of the reader. In particular, I have quoted largely from John de Fordun and Andrew de Wyntoun—the for-

mer of whom, or rather his continuator, has given us, in his "Scotichronicon," an account of the Priors of St Andrews down to his own time; while the latter, in his "Original Chronykyl of Skotland," confines himself chiefly to the Bishops of the diocese,—a coincidence which is somewhat remarkable; for, although these two writers were contemporaries, there is no reason to believe that either of them was aware of the progress, or even the existence of the other's work. Wyntoun was a canon-regular of the priory of St Andrews. In 1395 he was elected by his brother canons Prior of Lochleven, a dependency of their own, and one of the oldest religious houses in our country; having been founded for the Culdees, in the seventh century, by Brud son of Dargard king of the Picts, and endowed with ample revenues by subsequent kings and bishops of Scotland—a foundation that, "for centuries of darkness and violence, kept alive the lamp of a civilizing religion." There, doubtless, the good prior composed his "Chronykyl;" but there *now*—instead of a pious and learned fraternity pursuing their peaceful occupations, the only inhabitants of the little island are a few sheep, which find a partial shelter from the inclemency of the weather among the mural fragments of the ancient monastery. My quotations from the venerable Wyntoun, in the simple rhymes of the vernacular language of his day, will, I doubt not, be read by many with a lively interest. For an elegant and accurate edition of this work, antiquaries are deeply indebted to the late Mr David Macpherson.

We can never sufficiently regret that "the Register of the diocese of St Andrews" should have perished.

No volumes would have thrown so much light upon the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages of Scotland. We may conceive how large a collection of documents this work must have contained, when we know that even the Register of the comparatively small diocese of Moray, which has happily been preserved, occupies a closely-printed quarto volume of about 500 pages. The chartulary of our celebrated priory, however, has happily survived, or rather a copy of it; and, I am sorry to add, an imperfect copy. But, such as it is, it has recently been printed for the Bannatyne Club, by O. T. Bruce, Esq. of Falkland, from a copy in the possession of Lord Panmure, and has been of immense use to me in compiling my History of St Andrews. By Mr Bruce I was obligingly presented with a copy of that volume, on my making him acquainted with the work in which I was engaged. The defects of the Register are, in some measure, supplied by the Dennylne Papers, and various papal bulls; the originals of which are happily preserved in that depository of ancient learning, as well as modern literature, the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

When we consider the "violent and disordered" manner in which the Reformation was conducted in this country, the wonder is, not that so many of these documents should have perished, but that so many of them should have been saved. The lay-holders of church property perhaps thought that, if the charters were once destroyed, their possession of the lands was less likely to be questioned; and besides, they could have had no great pleasure in referring to manuscripts which, while defining the boundaries of their lands.

denounced, at the same time, a *curse* upon those who diverted them from their original pious destination, —a curse which, I have shown, was remarkably fulfilled, by the violent death, or failure of male issue, or both, of the sacrilegious plunderers.

When I come down to more modern times, I have endeavoured to represent, in their true light, those influential men who, in their day, acted conspicuous parts in St Andrews; and to remove some of the false glare and exaggerated colouring in which their too partial biographers have delighted to paint them. This remark applies more particularly to Calderwood's "History of the Church of Scotland," Dr M'Crie's Lives of "John Knox" and "Andrew Melville," as well as his "Miscellaneous Writings," and to Wodrow's "History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland," as edited by Dr Burns of Paisley. The statements of these writers, in their attacks on Episcopacy, have been too long permitted to influence the public mind. If we would get at the truth, it is necessary that something more should be advanced on the opposite side, particularly from those authentic sources which the literary clubs of Edinburgh and Glasgow have recently disclosed. It may be rash in me, indeed, to contend against such formidable opponents; but my pretensions rise no higher than to advocate the cause of religious and historical truth with the same zeal which, it seems to me, they have shown in impugning it.

Some may think that I have not done justice to the Scottish Reformers; and, I confess, that a close examination of their character and behaviour has rather tended to lower, than raise my admiration of them.

It may be questioned whether they were justified in assuming to themselves the difficult and responsible office of Reformers at all—an office, for the fulfilment of which few of them were qualified, and none of them possessed either divine or human authority. Their "zeal for the Lord" against the pope, seems to have resembled that of Jehu against Ahab; with this important difference, that they wanted the sovereign power and divine commission with which the Israelitish Reformer was invested for the due accomplishment of his task. Still, they did assume the office of Reformers, and they swept away some of the abuses of Romanism. But we must regret that, in doing this, they should have swept away much that was really valuable, the loss of which cannot now be recovered. We must also regret that few of the Reformers acted from praiseworthy motives; and, above all, that in getting rid of some acknowledged evils, they were not prepared to substitute a better ecclesiastical system in the room of the one which they had precipitately overthrown—a system that should have prevented those disorderly proceedings and repeated changes in the established religion of the country, which followed close upon the Reformation, and *are far from having yet subsided*. In short, we must lament that they were not prepared to constitute THE CHURCH upon the truly Catholic faith and practice of the first centuries, the rule so wisely acted upon by the English Reformers, the "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est,"—antiquity, universality, and general consent; "a rule," says the learned Bishop Sage, in his "Fundamental Charter of

Presbytery," "which the common sense of mankind cannot but justify, when it is considered soberly and seriously, without partiality or prejudice; a rule indeed, which, had the Reformers of the several churches followed unitedly and conscientiously, in those times when the churches in the western part of Europe were a-reforming, we had not had so many different faiths, so many different modes of worship, so many different governments and disciplines, as, alas! this day divide the Protestant churches, and, by consequence, weaken the Protestant interest; a rule which, had the pretenders to reformed religion in Scotland still stood by, we had not possibly had so many horrid rebellions, so many unchristian divisions, so many unaccountable revolutions, both in Church and State, as, to our sad experience, have, in the result, so unhinged all the principles of natural justice and honesty, and disabled, nay, eaten out the principles of Christianity among us, that now we are not so much disposed for anything as for downright atheism."

It is possible that some of my Presbyterian readers may consider that I have occasionally betrayed feelings unfriendly to their religious polity. On this subject I shall only say here, that, ever since I understood the difference between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, (a difference which, strange as it may appear, very few persons will give themselves the trouble to understand,) I have been satisfied that the latter is in a wrong position—a position which it is not probably destined to maintain. But my objection is to Presbyteri*anism*, not to Presbyter*ians*, whom it would be unfair to make responsible for the conduct of their predecessors, fur-

ther than they choose to identify themselves with it. With several Presbyterian ministers I live on the most friendly terms, who, I am sure, will not be offended at the freedom with which I have spoken of their system. Most of them, indeed, acknowledge the excellence of our Episcopacy, and would have no objections to see it established, if they could be sure of carrying the bulk of the nation along with them. Whether the existing Establishment, notwithstanding its acknowledged defects, be better than anything that is likely to be substituted in its room, were it subverted, I am not prepared to say; but I entertain, in common with many others, a deep conviction, that nothing has injured the cause of our common Christianity in these lands, so much as the establishing by law two churches, differing from each other so essentially, that there never was, and never can be, any religious communion between them. For when the people see their rulers, who are God's vicegerents upon earth and responsible to Him for their conduct, consenting to establish whatever system seems to them most *expedient*, without the least regard to TRUTH, which is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," what are they to conclude, but that religion is a mere piece of State policy, intended only to serve worldly interests and temporal purposes? What are they to infer when they see the State treating two religions with equal regard—nay, granting endowments to various anti-church communities, both at home and in the colonies,—what can the people infer, but that their rulers consider none of them of much importance? But waiving this, either the difference between the two Established churches is

essential, or it is small. If essential, as we Episcopalians hold, they cannot both be branches of Christ's "one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church;" and if the difference be small, as some very liberal persons allege, then the lesser, in not uniting with the greater, must be guilty of *schism*—a sin which is as strongly condemned in Scripture as any that can be named. So that, in whatever point of view we regard the matter, a heavy load of responsibility lies both upon our rulers and people, for suffering things to remain in their present anomalous and most unchristian state. Not that it is meant by this that the Scottish Episcopal Church seeks to be received into connexion with the State. I believe, on the contrary, that our bishops and clergy, though they cannot boast much of the advantages of the Voluntary system, have no desire whatever, even if they had the means, to avail themselves of the existing distractions for their own reëstablishment. Their practice has always been, not to lead Providence, as is now too commonly done, but to wait patiently till they are led *by* Providence—persuaded that "in quietness and in confidence is their strength." But it, nevertheless, remains an incontrovertible truth, that, for the same government to establish, in the same island, two fundamentally different religious communities, was, to say the least, purchasing a precarious peace at the expense of principle; and must therefore prove, in the end, no less impolitic and injurious, than it was time-serving and inconsistent.

If, in the following pages, I have dwelt longer than, to some, may seem proper, on the defects of the system established by Andrew Melville, resumed during the

Grand Rebellion, confirmed at the Revolution, and now more rampant than ever, under the names of Invisible-headship, and Non-intrusionism,—I have only to assign, as my reason, that as that system is still upheld by a considerable portion of the community, my object was to open their eyes, if possible, to the evils which uniformly, and I conceive necessarily, spring out of it; and, in doing this, I have rested my proofs chiefly on the admissions of its advocates, and on historical facts, as recorded by themselves. The language and behaviour of the leading men, at the several periods just referred to, are so strikingly alike, that accident will not account for the resemblance: it must be sought for in some inherent peculiarity of the system; or in what one of the most strenuous of its modern defenders calls "the bold republicanism of Presbytery."

Since the foregoing was written, the anticipated secession from the Scottish Establishment has occurred. All the circumstances connected with it tend to confirm the remarks I have interspersed in that part of my history which relates to the period between the Reformation and the Revolution, as to the true character of Presbyterianism, *when carried out to its natural results*, and the consequences which may at all times be expected from the ascendancy of *puritanical democracy*. It seems to me that the Seceders, even on their own principles, and admitting that they are much in the right in their quarrel with the State, as they fondly persuade themselves, ought to have remained at their posts, and *patiently suffered* for their testimony to the truth. This would have been a more Christian course, nay, more effectual in ultimately

gaining their own object, than throwing off all control, running away from danger, adding one more to the numerous sects which are already the reproach of Protestantism, distracting the minds of the ignorant, and stirring up a popular agitation against "the powers that be, which are ordained of God." But then, this would have looked very like an approximation to the doctrine of "passive obedience," which they have always repudiated. Nevertheless, by following an opposite course, they have incurred a more awful responsibility; and there is too much reason to fear, judging from the well-known character of their leaders, and the historical precedents with which they identify themselves, that they will use their influence for evil much more than for good, under the mistaken conviction "that they are doing God service;" breathing out, as they openly do, hatred of the Establishment which they have quitted,—of the civil government,—the courts of law,—the aristocracy of the land,—and, above all, of Episcopacy, which they are constantly labouring to disparage under the name of *Puseyism*. The effect of all this must be, the increase of fanaticism, insubordination, and infidelity; though we must hope that a gracious Providence will overrule all in the end for good. But, in the meantime, the movement involves an attempt to throw Scotland back two centuries,—to the era, namely, of the Grand Rebellion: nay, it so happens, to the very *year* of the Solemn League and Covenant and the Westminster Assembly; the first of which they will probably revive, as they have already announced their resolution to celebrate the bi-centenary of the second!

But I must not dwell here on this painful subject. Let us pray that Heaven may, in mercy, avert from us a renewal of the fatal consequences to which the movement of 1643 gave rise; or rather, save us from "our offences, and the offences of our forefathers," which are too likely to bring down, in some form or other, the divine judgments on our heads!

I take this opportunity of returning my grateful thanks to the learned Principals and Professors of this University, for access to their valuable library, without which I could scarcely have executed my task; and more particularly am I obliged to their librarian, Mr M'Bean, for the readiness with which he at all times exerted himself to procure for me the books which I required—a liberality on the part of these gentlemen the more commendable, because they must have been aware that I was engaged in a work which would contain religious opinions differing materially from their own.

To the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh, I have also been greatly indebted for the use of several scarce books and MSS.; and especially are my acknowledgments due to W. Turnbull, Esq., F.S.A. Scot., a member of that learned body, for his kindness in aiding my researches, and particularly in transcribing for me various manuscript documents which were not allowed to be removed from the Library.

I will now conclude this long preface, by observing, that if, in the course of my work, opinions are advanced which will not be generally responded to in this self-styled liberal and enlightened age, particularly in Scotland,—I have only to say, that nothing is advanced

which I am not ready to defend,—nothing of which I am not deeply convinced, both of the truth and the importance,—and nothing but what I have the satisfaction to know has been held by an immense majority of the wise and the good in all ages.

St Andrews, *June* 1843.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

CHAPTER I.

LOCALITY OF ST ANDREWS.

	Page
Description of the city and neighbourhood,	1
Present and former population,	2
Old plans remaining—Scores—Harbour,	4
Ancient and modern state of the city—Statistics,	5
Climate—Temperature—Rain—Winds—Geology,	6
Mandate of Bishop Bane as to the encroachment of the sea,	12
Bull of Pope Gregory XI. on the same subject,	13
Supposed upheavings of the land,	15

CHAPTER II.

TRADITIONAL ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE CITY.

History of St Regulus,	16
Probability of its truth—Relics of St Andrew,	19
St Regulus' (or Lady Buchan's) cave,	21
The Pictish king, Hungus, assisted by St Andrew,	22
His ample gifts to the church in consequence,	24
Kenneth II. confirms the same—Abernethy,	25

CHAPTER III.

THE CULDEES.

Culdean monastery at St Andrews—Marriage of their priests,	26
How far connected with Rome—St Ninian—St Palladius,	28
Abbot of Iona—Nature of his authority over bishops,	29
Culdeeism merges into Romanism,	32
Early bishops of Scotland,	35
Episcopacy the only known polity in ancient times,	37

CHAPTER IV.

LIVES AND TIMES OF THE BISHOPS OF ST ANDREWS, FROM THEIR COMMENCEMENT IN THE NINTH CENTURY, TILL THE DEATH OF BISHOP ROBERT, THE FOUNDER OF THE AUGUSTINIAN PRIORY, IN A.D. 1159, IN WHOSE EPISCOPATE THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE WAS FIRST ACKNOWLEDGED THROUGHOUT SCOTLAND.

	Page
Extent of the diocese of St Andrews,	39
ST ADRIAN, the first bishop—Killed by the Danes in the Isle of May,	40
KELLACH I.—Religious convention at Scone,	41
Constantine III. becomes abbot of the Culdees,	42
FOTHAD I. banished from his see—His silver casket,	43
Lochleven priory—Tithes, parishes, and patronage,	44
MALISIUS I.—Religious convention at Forfar,	45
KELLACH II. said to go to Rome for confirmation,	ib.
FOTHAD II. negotiates a peace between Grime and Malcolm,	46
Diocese of Aberdeen—Monymusk,	ib.
MALDUN—Grants to Lochleven priory—Macbeth,	47
FOTHAD III. marries Malcolm III. to Margaret—Convention at St Andrews,	49
GREGORY—Veremundus archdeacon of St Andrews,	50
GODRICUS crowns King Edgar, who founds Coldingham priory,	51
TURGOT consecrated by the Archbishop of York—Parish church of St Andrews,	52
Its altarages and choristers—Their subsequent appropriation,	54
The bishop resigns, and retires to Durham—His works,	55
EADMERE, his acceptance and resignation of the see,	56
ROBERT, grant of the "Cursus Apri"—Ceremony on the occasion,	61
Deed of the bishop's consecration by the Archbishop of York,	64
Foundation of the priory—Its constitution,	65
Interview between David I. and the bishop,	67
St Andrews made a royal burgh—Its early commerce,	69
Papal legate—Bull of Honorius II.—and of Adrian IV.,	70
The bishop's death, and place of burial—Seal,	72
Robert, the first prior of the monastery,	73
Bull of Alexander III. as to the next bishop,	ib.

CHAPTER V.

LIVES AND TIMES OF THE BISHOPS OF ST ANDREWS, FROM THE SUCCESSION OF BISHOP ARNOLD IN A.D. 1159, THE FOUNDER OF THE CATHEDRAL, TILL THE DEATH OF BISHOP MALVOISINE, IN 1238.

	Page
St Waldeve offered the see, but refuses it,	75
ARNOLD, elected and consecrated—Foundation of the cathedral,	76
Its slow progress—Monastic buildings connected with it,	77
Malcolm IV.'s free grant to the city,	78
The bishop's address to the king recommending him to marry,	79
His death, burial, and seal,	81
RICHARD—Cause of the delay in his consecration,	82
Goes to England to treat of King William's ransom,	83
Claim of the Archbishop of York—Speech of Canon Gilbert,	84
Treaty of ecclesiastical subjection cancelled by the pope,	86
The bishop's gifts to the priory—His mandate as to the building of the cathedral,	87
Death, burial, seal,	88
Walter and Gilbert, second and third priors of the monastery,	ib.
HUGH and JOHN—The king supports the one, the pope the other,	89
The protracted dispute ends in Hugh's favour,	95
John gets the diocese of Dunkeld, and divides it into two,	96
Value of the Scottish bishopries at this time,	97
ROGER—Builds the castle of St Andrews—His consecration,	ib.
A papal legate holds a council at Perth,	98
The bishop's charters—Death, burial, and epitaph—Seals,	99
MALVOISINE, translated from Glasgow,	101
Embassy to England—Council at Perth—Coronation of Alexander II.,	ib.
Council at Rome—Its acts—Middle-age corruptions,	102
Papal interdict upon Scotland,	103
Honorius III.'s authority to the church of Scotland—Canons,	104
The bishop brings the Dominicans into Scotland—His other works,	106
His death—The first who is buried in the cathedral—Seal,	107
Thomas, Simon, and Henry, the fourth, fifth, and sixth priors of the monastery—Their character, and works,	108

CHAPTER VI.

LIVES AND TIMES OF THE BISHOPS OF ST ANDREWS, FROM THE SUCCESSION OF DAVID DE BERNHAM IN 1238, TILL THE DEATH OF WILLIAM DE LAMBERTON, IN 1328, IN WHOSE EPISCOPATE THE CATHEDRAL WAS COMPLETED AND DEDICATED IN THE PRESENCE OF ROBERT THE BRUCE.

	Page
BERNHAM—His consecration—Council at Perth,	110
Called to a council at Lyons, but stopped on the way,	111
Coronation of Alexander III.—Translation of St Margaret,	112
The Scottish bishops remonstrate with the king—Bernham's death and burial,	114
John White, the seventh prior of the monastery,	115
ABEL thrust on the prior and canons against their consent,	116
His character, death, and burial,	117
GAMELINE—His consecration—Persecuted—The king's designs against the church,	118
The bishop baptizes the king's son—Renewed persecution—Peace restored,	120
His gifts to the priory—Death, and burial,	122
Gilbert II., the eighth prior of the monastery,	ib.
WISHART—Intercourse between Rome and the European churches,	123
The bishop a pluralist—Council of Lyons—Its acts,	124
Revenue of the see—Dominican monastery here,	125
Progress of the cathedral—The bishop's death and burial,	127
FRASER—His consecration—Culdees—Right of coining conferred,	128
The bishop made one of the regents of Scotland,	130
His letter to Edward I.—Baliol and Bruce,	ib.
Priory of the Isle of May—Baliol's tameness—His revolt,	134
The bishop dies, and is buried abroad—His heart brought home—Seals,	135
John de Haddenton, the ninth prior of the monastery,	136
Edward I. subdues Baliol, but refuses to favour Bruce,	137
Edward comes to St Andrews—Rise of Wallace,	138
His alleged cruelties to the English—He expels the acting bishop,	139
St Andrews "wasted full plane," after the battle of Falkirk,	141
LAMBERTON—Dispute between him and the Culdees,	142
Made one of the governors of Scotland—Boniface VIII.,	143
Edward invades Scotland, and comes to St Andrews—His acts,	144

Page

Bruce unites with the bishop against Edward, and kills Cumyn, ... 145
Sir James Douglas joins Bruce, ... 147
The bishop crowns Bruce at Scone—Countess of Buchan, . 148
Edward's severity after the battle of Methven, . . . 149
The bishop taken and imprisoned in England—Edward's letter to Clement V., ... 151
The bishop released on renewing his oath to Edward II., . 153
Again breaks it—Battle of Bannockburn, ... 154
The bishop improves the state of his diocese, . . . 155
Edward III. supplicates John XXII. to depose the bishop—The pope's answer, ... 156
Dedication of the cathedral, ... 158
Edward again writes to the pope on the former subject, . 159
The bishop's seal, death, monument, ... 161
Adam de Mauchan, and John de Forfar, the tenth and eleventh priors of the monastery, ... 162

CHAPTER VII.

LIVES AND TIMES OF THE BISHOPS OF ST ANDREWS, FROM THE SUCCESSION OF JAMES DE BANE IN 1328 TILL THE DEATH OF JAMES KENNEDY, THE LAST BISHOP OF ST ANDREWS, IN 1466.

BANE appointed by the pope, ... 162
Crowns and anoints David II. and his queen, . . . 164
The bishop and king both obliged to fly from Scotland, . 165
Death and burial of the bishop at Bourges—Epitaph, . 166
Edward III.'s three letters recommending to the pope a bishop for St Andrews, ... ib.
Convention at Dairsey—Castle of St Andrews taken, . 169
John of Gowrie, the twelfth prior of the monastery, . . ib.
LANDEL obtains the see after nine years' vacancy, . . 170
David II. taken prisoner by the English, ... 172
The bishop negotiates for his ransom—His various journeys, 173
David marries Margaret Logie, at Inchmurtach, . . 174
Dispute between St Andrews and Cupar, ... 175
Burning of the cathedral—Damage and repairs, . . . ib.
The bishop's death, funeral, and testament—Seal, . . 176
W. de Loudon and T. Bisset, the thirteenth and fourteenth priors—Their character and works, ... 178
Stephen de Pay, the fifteenth prior—His repairs of the cathedral, ... 180

Page

Stephen de Pay—Taken prisoner by the English—His death, ... 181
Trail—"referendarius" at Avignon—Papal schism, . . 183
Funeral of Robert II., and coronation of Robert III., . 184
The bishop goes abroad—Dukes of Albany and Rothesay—"Wolf of Badenoch," 185
Bishop's death and character—Epitaph—Gifts to the church—Seal, ... 186
Robert of Montrose the sixteenth prior—His tragical death, 188
T. Stewart, brother of Robert III.—Why not confirmed, 190
Murder of the Duke of Rothesay, ... 192
W. de Danyelstone bargains for the see—His bad character, 193
Danyelstone—His election, and short episcopate, . . 195
James Bisset, the seventeenth prior—His character, . . 196
Wardlaw—Gilbert bishop of Aberdeen chosen, but not confirmed, ... 199
Earl of Northumberland comes to St Andrews, . . 200
Robert III. puts his son under the bishop's care, . . 201
Foundation of the University—Monastic schools, . . 204
Rival popes—Benedict XIII. deposed, ... 205
James I. returns from England—Crowned by the bishop, . 207
Paul Craw burnt at St Andrews—Remarks, . . . 208
Bridge over the Eden—The bishop's death and character, . 212
His speech to James I. on temperance—His other works, . 214
W. de Camera, the eighteenth prior—John Lyster, . . 215
J. Haldenstone, the nineteenth prior—Character and epitaph, 216
Kennedy—His rank and character—Reforms, . . 218
Founds St Salvator's college—His quarrel with the Douglases, 222
They are denounced and defeated—James II., . . . 223
"Golden charter"—Franciscan monastery here—Barge, . . 225
The bishop is made guardian of James III.—Death—Seals. 228
W. Bonar and D. Ramsay, the twentieth and twenty-first priors, 229

CHAPTER VIII.

Lives and Times of the Archbishops of St Andrews, from the Succession of Archbishop Graham in 1466, till the Death of Archbishop Forman in 1522.

Graham—Obscure notices concerning him, . . . 230
Made archbishop and primate—His numerous enemies, . 232
Organized opposition to him, ... 234
His condemnation, imprisonment, and death—Seal. . . 236

Page
W. Carron, the twenty-second prior—A new diocese, . 237
Shevez—His consecration—Frequent journeys to England, 238
His astronomical reputation—Pilgrimage to Fordun, . 240
Glasgow made an archbishopric—Consequent jealousy, . 241
The primate's death—His grant to St Salvator's college—Seal, 243
J. Stewart, son of James III.—Visits Rome, . . 244
Commended by Ariosto—Death and funeral—Seal, . . 245
A. Stewart, son of James IV.—Education under Erasmus, 247
The king's letter to Julius II. concerning him, . . 249
The primate's church preferment—Abuses—Reflections, . 251
Behaviour and death at Flodden—St Mary's college—Seal, 252
J. Hepburn the twenty-third prior—St Leonard's college, . 253
Forman—Competition for the primacy—Gavin Douglas, . 255
Forman's early history—Letters between James IV. and Julius II. 257
Nominated to the primacy—Compromise with Prior Hepburn, 259
Made one of the governors of Scotland—Character—Death—Seal, ... 260
Hepburn's character—Wall round the monastery, . . 263
P. Hepburn, the twenty-fourth prior, ... 264

CHAPTER IX.

Lives and Times of the Archbishops of St Andrews, from the Succession of Archbishop James Beaton in 1523, till the Murder of Cardinal Beaton, in 1546.

J. Beaton—Douglas again competes for the primacy—His death, ... 264
The primate's church preferment—Imprisonment and release, 265
He receives French emissaries at St Andrews—His numerous guests, ... 266
James V. escapes from the Douglases, ... 268
Feat of archery here—The primate again imprisoned, . 270
James's second marriage—Mary of Guise, . . . 272
Her arrival, reception, and marriage here, . . . 273
James's letter to Henry VIII. on the birth of a son, . 275
Death of this and another son—Patrick Hamilton, . . 276
Alexander Seaton—H. Forrest—Knox—Buchanan, . . 279
The primate endows St Mary's college—His death—Seal, 284
Lord James Stewart, the twenty-fifth and last prior of the monastery, ... 286
D. Beaton—Early history—Sir J. Borthwick, . . . ib.

Page
Henry VIII. tries to prejudice James V. against the cardinal, 290
He buys over the Solway prisoners to his interest, . . 291
The cardinal's imprisonment and release, . . . 293
Henry's two invasions of Scotland—Threatened destruction of St Andrews, ... 294
Plot to murder the cardinal—Character and execution of Wishart, ... 295
Collier's just reflections on his conduct, ... 298
Murder of the cardinal—His character, ... 301
Foundation of the charges against him, ... 304

CHAPTER X.

LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN HAMILTON ARCHBISHOP OF ST ANDREWS, FROM HIS SUCCESSION IN 1546, TILL THE REFORMATION IN 1560.

HAMILTON—His early history—Castle of St Andrews besieged, 307
A truce—The siege renewed—John Rough, . . . 308
Knox joins the conspirators—His "Call to the Ministry," 310
Disputes with the Romanists—His defective views, . . 312
The French take the castle and Knox—A party of English invade Fife, ... 314
The primate endows St Mary's college—Two provincial councils, 316
Hamilton's catechism—The St Andrews Press, . . 318
The primate falls sick—Cured by Cardan, . . . 320
Maxims of the Reformers—W. Mill tried and burnt, . 322
Provincial council—Knox returns to Scotland, . . 328
He arrives at St Andrews—The Earl of Argyll, . . 329
The Lord James—The queen's letter to him, . . 331
The reforming ministers—Knox preaches at St Andrews, . 334
Destruction of the religious buildings—Cathedral, . . 336
The Scoto-Roman church subverted—Remarks, . . 339

CHAPTER XI.

LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN HAMILTON ARCHBISHOP OF ST ANDREWS, FROM THE REFORMATION IN 1560, TILL HIS MURDER IN 1571.—THE KNOXIAN SYSTEM.

The primate's letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow—Reign of terror, ... 344
Narrow escape of the primate—Influence of English gold, . 346
Knox and the Lord James—Knox's language, . . . 347

Page
Queen Mary here—Chatelard, ... 349
Randolph's account of Mary while here—The primate imprisoned, ... 350
Mary and Darnley here—Their proclamation—Reflections, 352
Baptism of James VI.—Non-observance of holydays, . 357
Battle of Langside—Regent Moray's cruelty, . . 360
He is shot—The primate is hanged—Morton obtains his archiepiscopal revenues, ... 362
Apology for Hamilton and Beaton, ... 364
Change at St Andrews—Goodman—His character and recantation, ... 366
Superintendants—Patronage—Disposal of church property, 370
Book of the Universall Kirk—Immorality of the nation, . 372
D. Ferguson's sermon—Primate's advice to Knox, . . 374
Defect in the Reformation, ... 377

CHAPTER XII.

HISTORY OF ST ANDREWS, FROM THE MURDER OF ARCHBISHOP HAMILTON IN 1571, TILL THE DEATH OF PATRICK ADAMSON, TITULAR ARCHBISHOP OF ST ANDREWS, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN 1592.—TULCHAN EPISCOPACY.

Character of Tulchan episcopacy, ... 379
DOUGLAS made archbishop—His election and installation, 381
Censured by the General Assembly—His Death—Knox at St Andrews, ... 385
His disputes with the queen's party—A witch burnt, . 386
ADAMSON the next archbishop—His early history, . . 389
Andrew Melville comes here—His character and opinions, 391
Opposes Adamson—A sermon of his—Raid of Ruthven, . 393
His concern in it, and flight to England, . . . 399
Adamson preaches in London, ... 401
Convention of the Three Estates here—Envoys from Denmark, ib.
The two Melvilles and Adamson—Turbulent proceedings, 403
The plague at St Andrews—Pulpit altercation—Adamson's sermon at Edinburgh, ... 405
The king and Sieur de Barras visit this university, . 407
Duke of Lennox gets the archiepiscopal revenues, . . 408
Disordered state of the three colleges—Choice of a minister, 410
Adamson's troubles and death—The Melvillian system established, ... 414
Opposed by the early reformers—Reflections. . . 416

CHAPTER XIII.

History of St Andrews, from the first Establishment of Presbyterianism in 1592, till the Restoration of a Canonical Episcopacy in 1610.—The Melvillian System.

Page

New order of the priesthood—Ordination, . . . 419
Civil magistrate subordinate to the kirk, . . . 421
Archery tumult here—Popish lords persecuted, . . 422
Disturbance here—Melville's address to the king, . . 425
Pulpit scurrilities—Tumult in Edinburgh—Bruce and Welsh, 427
Ruined condition of the Kirk—Melville's delinquencies, . 430
More pulpit scurrilities—Scene between the king and the ministers, ... 433
Titular Episcopacy restored—James succeeds Elizabeth, . 435
Gladstones, titular archbishop of St Andrews—His revenues, ... 438
Trial of Lord Balmerino—Parity ministers, . . . 439
End of Andrew Melville, ... 440

CHAPTER XIV.

Lives and Times of the Archbishops of St Andrews, from the Restoration of Canonical Episcopacy in 1610, till the Outbreak of the Grand Rebellion in 1638.

Consecration of Gladstones and the other Scottish bishops, 442
The primate's death and character—Calumnious imputations, 444
Spotswood made primate—The king comes to Edinburgh, 447
Then to St Andrews—Proceedings here—His speech to the bishops and clergy, ... 449
Calderwood—General Assembly at St Andrews and Perth, 454
English Liturgy—Refractory ministers, ... 456
Jealousy and cupidity of the tithe-holders, . . . 461
Charles's oath at his coronation—Reflections, ... 463
Edinburgh made a bishopric—Compensation to the primacy, 465
The primate made chancellor—The liturgy Rejected, and why, 466
Means used to overthrow Episcopacy—National Covenant, 471
General Assembly—A. Johnston, and other "Scots Worthies," 473

HISTORY

OF

ST ANDREWS.

CHAPTER I.

Locality of St Andrews.

It would be superfluous to say much on this subject. They who have never been at a place cannot form a clear idea of it from mere description; and to those who have been there, description is unnecessary. I shall only say, therefore, that the city stands upon a rocky eminence, about fifty feet above the level of the sea; and that the view of the bay, as seen from the heights to the south, is exceedingly beautiful, as much so, perhaps, as anything of the kind in Scotland,—having the range of the Sidlaw and Grampian hills in the distant north, the estuary of the river Tay appearing immediately below them; the Eden on the left, winding down its richly-cultivated banks; and on the right, the German Ocean studded with sails—the Bell-rock lighthouse being dimly seen in the distance by day, but, after sun-set, throwing out a brilliant revolving light. The grey steeples and turrets of the city have a very venerable and picturesque appearance, and recall the most interesting historical associations. The Links, to the north-west, are admitted to be the best adapted of any in Scotland for the national game of golf; and, at certain seasons, from the influx of players

and spectators, present a gay and animated appearance. The adjacent sands, at ebb-tide, are distinguished for being at once, hard, dry, and spacious, and equally adapted for a drive or a promenade. And lastly, the parallel ridges of rock which run out into the sea immediately opposite the town, form, when the tide has partially retired, secure and sheltered bathing-places for the inhabitants.

The three main streets of the city, one of which is half a mile in length, diverge from the ruins of the cathedral in such a manner, that the latter is seen at the eastern extremity of each of them. From this it might be supposed, that they were not planned till after the foundation of that edifice in the twelfth century. But, most probably, they began to be built at a much earlier period, and were meant to diverge from the Culdean monastery and St Regulus' church, both in the vicinity of the cathedral; the former of which was, and the latter is, the oldest building in St Andrews, or perhaps in Scotland.

Before the Reformation, the city, judging from two old plans which remain, was not of much greater extent than it is at present; but it was, undoubtedly, much more densely inhabited. Its population has been estimated at from twelve to fifteen thousand. It is certain, at any rate, that Perth, Aberdeen, and St Andrews were at one time the three most populous as well as most commercial towns in Scotland; and there is good reason to think that this city was more populous than either of the other two. An act of the Scottish Parliament in 1526 has these words:—"The principal towns of merchandise in this realm, that is to say, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Striveling [Stirling,] Sanct Androis, Sanct Johnston [Perth,] and Dundee." Paulus Jovius, an Italian writer who, it will be seen, wrote in the episcopate of Cardinal Beaton, thus

briefly speaks of the city:—"Beyond the Forth, at the mouth of which is seen the castle of Dunbar, occurs the region of Fife, remarkable for the city of St Andrews, a place illustrious as the seat of the ecclesiastical primacy, the authority of its schools, and its *harbour;* over which presides, at this day, David Beaton, distinguished by the dignity of the purple cap, by the splendour of his life, and the profundity of his genius." Even so late as 1572, a book recently printed, called "A Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland," tells us that, in that year, "The Inglis ambassadour past throw the country to visie the strenthis of the same quhilk was in the hands of the favouraris of the king; sic as Sanct Andros, Perth, Dundee, Striveling."—(P. 291.) But since that time, while all other towns have been gradually advancing, this, from the loss of its archiepiscopal preëminence, has been as gradually retrograding. In a document dated 1697, which I shall have occasion to quote in Chap. XIX., the place is called "only a *village*, where most part farmers dwell." Mr Pennant, who was here in 1770, says, the population then scarcely exceeded two thousand; for whom, he adds, "two bakers were sufficient; whereas, before the Reformation, there had been seventy of these necessary personages." How far this information was accurate, or whether it could be considered as affording a criterion of the comparative population of different ages, we will not stop to inquire; but certainly there has been a reaction since the above year, inasmuch as the city can now boast of between four and five thousand inhabitants. The same author informs us, that whereas there had been sixty or seventy vessels belonging to the place during Cromwell's usurpation, in his time there was "only *one* of any size." At present there are ten or twelve. He makes, moreover, the following reflection:—"A

foreigner, ignorant of the history of this country, would naturally inquire, What calamity has this city undergone? Has it suffered a bombardment from some barbarous enemy? Has it, like Lisbon, felt the more inevitable fury of an earthquake? But how great is his horror in reflecting, that this destruction was owing to the more barbarous zeal of a minister, who, by his discourses, first inflamed and then permitted a furious crowd to overthrow edifices dedicated to that Being he pretended to honour by their ruin!"

Dr Johnson, three years after Pennant, describes with equal indignation, and assigns to the same cause, "the silence and solitude of inactive indigence and gloomy depopulation," which he observed to reign in the streets of the ancient city.

It has been commonly asserted, on the authority of tradition, that the Scores or Swallowgate was once an inhabited street; but my plans of St Andrews, one of which is of 1642, and the other of a much older though uncertain date,[1] represent the Scores[2] without a single house, and as lying, moreover, outside the walls and gates of the city. And another proof of its having been uninhabited is, that in the numerous old

[1] See a copy of the plan, or bird's-eye view here referred to, annexed to this volume. I should suppose the date to be about 1530 or 1540. It contains some exaggerations and inaccuracies, and yet it is in the usual style of plans of that period. Instead of being parallel, the streets should diverge from the cathedral; and on the cathedral itself the turrets are *four times* the height that they ought to be! The central turret is probably meant to represent the steeple, which the artist seems to have reduced in thickness, lest it should come into apparent contact with the adjacent parts of the building. If so, nothing could be in worse taste.

[2] The derivation of the word *Scores* has given rise to many conjectures. It is probably from *Scaur*, a rock, in allusion either to the rocky eminence on which the road called "the Scores" runs, or to the rocks which jut out into the sea beneath it. Thus we have Scarborough, Scor-ton, Scorsby or Scores-bay, Scairs-burn, &c. Sir Walter Scott says that, in the south of Scotland, the word *Scaurs* means "precipitous earthen banks."—*Monastery*, vol. i. p. 13.

charters which are preserved among the city records, many of which contain allusions to the locality of the houses and tenements, there is no mention made of any house in Swallowgate.

With respect to the shipping which formerly resorted to this place, it is affirmed by Martine, that during the annual Senzie market, which began the second week after Easter, and lasted fifteen days,[1] the harbour and roadstead were frequented by between two and three hundred vessels. This derives confirmation from the great number of vessels which are represented, both in the harbour and the offing, in the older of the two plans already referred to. It has, indeed, occasioned surprise, that so great a number could lie in the harbour, which is small, or in the roadstead, which is much exposed during an eastern gale. But it should be considered, that the vessels were probably small, and that, if they dreaded a gale from the east, and a rocky lee shore, they could always find ample shelter in the adjacent estuary of the Eden.

The contrast between St Andrews as it was before the Reformation, and as it now is, has been not inaptly described in the following lines by Lady Margaret Fordyce:—

> Whose broken gates a cheerless welcome give.
> The ample streets where once proud prelates rode,
> And barons oft had met their king in state,
> Deserted all. No sound of glee or mirth
> Disturbs the silence of the grass-grown path,
> Where bleating flocks obtain their scanty meal.
> The long procession and the chanting priest,
> The busy idleness, the hum of men,
> Are o'er; save where the hind and fisherman
> Saunter with steps unfrequent, heard from far.
> Where lofty edifices towered on high
> The ragged cottage lifts its lowly head,
> Whose owners gain a pittance from the sea's
> Precarious element—precarious gain!

[1] See Appendix, No. XLV.

> The venerable piles to learning raised
> Are laid on earth; or if a spire remain,
> It mourns his brother prostrate in the dust.
> Where knees devout the marble pavement prest,
> The loathsome toad among the weeds lies safe,
> And holy water drops in dews from heaven.
> The swallow twitters through the ruined tower,
> And ravens nestle on the sacred Cross!

The longitude of the city is 2° 49′ 1″ west, and its latitude 56° 20′ 30″ north.

St Andrews, Cupar, Crail, East and West Anstruther, Kilrenny, and Pittenweem, unite in sending a member to Parliament. The number of qualified voters for the whole district is about 700.

St Andrews is the seat of a presbytery, which consists of twenty parishes. Seven of these, having been formerly in the gift of the archbishop of the diocese, are now in that of the crown; two of them are in the gift of the United College, and the rest in that of private patrons. The presbytery itself is under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Fife.

The Dukedom of St Andrews is the Scottish title appropriated to one of the younger sons of the royal family.

Climate.—Like the rest of the east coast of Scotland, this city and neighbourhood feel the east wind, especially during the spring months, when it is sometimes accompanied by a thick chilly mist called *haar*. This wind, however, is remarkably dry, as is indicated by the hygrometer; and it is far from being a cold wind, as is proved by the thermometer: and yet, such is its effect upon the human system, from its rapid absorption of the perspirable matter, that it produces a cold and uncomfortable sensation to all who are exposed to it, and is even dangerous to persons of delicate constitutions. The same observation was made respecting the climate of St Andrews so long ago as

the year 1697. "This place is a most thin and piercing air, even to an excess, seeing that nitre grows upon the walls of chambers where fires are used, if there be a light to the north; and this is the reason why old men, coming to the place, are instantly cut off." This assertion is greatly exaggerated, since it is well known to be only those who are subject to pulmonary complaints who suffer from our *haurs*. These haurs are thus accounted for: The cool breeze from the eastern part of the German Ocean, comes into contact with the warm exhalations arising from the west, and by condensing them, converts them into a cold vapour and perceptible moisture. This vapour is driven by the breeze on our coast; and is durable and general, or only local and temporary, according to the extent and density of the said exhalations, and the time required to precipitate the moisture with which they are impregnated. The easterly winds blow chiefly in the spring; but the south-west prevails during by far the greater part of the year, and is always pleasant and refreshing when not too violent. The vicinity of the sea has the effect of moderating the cold in winter, and of cooling the air in summer; so that the temperature of St Andrews is more equal throughout the year than that of places in the interior; and it has been remarked that, even in severe winters, snow seldom lies long on the ground.

One of the medical gentlemen of this place thus expresses himself, in the year 1827, in regard to the general healthiness of St Andrews:—"The great width of the streets, and the extensive gardens interspersed, afford the fullest ventilation; and except in some of the narrow closes, there is no obstacle to the admission of pure air into the houses of the inhabitants. We have no table of the ages to which the inhabitants live; but I am persuaded that the average of years is greater

than in most other towns. Epidemic diseases are scarcely known in the city. During a residence of nearly twenty years, I have not known typhus fever epidemic within it, though it has prevailed in the neighbouring districts. In 1810, it was very prevalent in the landward part of the parish, particularly in the western division, where, in one small village, I had at one time nearly twenty patients, while in the city there were few or none. The same took place in 1818, when St Andrews seemed to be almost the only place in the united kingdom that was not visited by that epidemic."

Temperature.—The following is the mean monthly temperature for a period of six successive years, (viz., from 1821 to 1826 inclusive,) by observations taken at 10 o'clock A.M., and 10 o'clock P.M., from a thermometer about 75 feet above the level of the sea, with a northern exposure :—

January,	36.534
February,	39.450
March,	41.367
April,	46.599
May,	50.798
June,	56.832
July,	60.030
August,	59.018
September,	55.370
October,	48.764
November,	42.235
December,	39.129
Mean temperature for the above six years,	48.010

Rain.—There never was any regular register kept of the quantity of rain which falls at St Andrews, that I am aware of, except for the years 1835 and 1836, by the late Dr Jackson, Professor of Natural Philosophy. The fall for the first of these years was 24.28 inches; and that for the second, which was an unusually wet year everywhere, was 34 inches. But owing to the

little attention which has been paid to this department of science, I have not been able to ascertain, after a great deal of inquiry, the comparative fall in other parts of Scotland and the north of England, for more than one of the above years—viz., 1835. The following is the result :—

St Andrews,	24.23	inches.
Elgin,	24.080	"
Kinfauns, near Perth,	25.60	"
Edinburgh,	25.22	"
Carlisle,	34.3293	"
Whitehaven,	54.135	"
Kendal,	55.891	"

Winds.—By observations on the wind, carefully made under the superintendence of the officer of the Coast-guard Service at this station, the following average annual result has been obtained :—

North, and the points adjacent,	46	days.
East, ditto,	80	"
South, ditto,	40	"
West and south-west,	189	"
Calm,	10	"
	365	days.

The east wind prevails chiefly in the months of April and May.

Geology.—The rocks that compose the promontory on which the town is built, belong to the independent coal formation ; and consist of the materials which generally go under the name of the coal metals. The strata dip southerly and easterly, at an angle of about 20°. The alternations of soft clay and calm with hard compact sand stone, conjoined with the regularity of the dip, and direction of the strata, give a peculiar feature to the coast. Near to where the old "Butts" were situated, there are several alternate strata of clay and ironstone, the latter containing about 30 per cent

of pure iron. Pieces of these are washed out, and rolled about by the sea; and are sometimes collected and shipped to the Carron or other iron-works. A thin bed of ferruginous limestone, rich in encrinites and fossil shells, stretches along to the "Butts," not much above the level of the low-water line. In the precipitous cliff above, near its top, is to be seen a thin seam of coal, and another at the bottom; and, as we proceed round by the castle, several parallel seams may be observed, some rising above those just mentioned, and others dipping below them. This is thought to be the most northern coal of any in Great Britain. In some parts of this cliff, and among the rocks at its base, fragments of what are considered tropical palm-trees are found in a state of petrifaction. Towards the south-east, at what are called the "Kinkell braes," the most singular convolutions and windings of the strata may be observed; while in some spots, the hardest rocks and the most friable sandstone are found side by side, containing vegetable and fossil remains. Here the dip of the strata is usually in the opposite direction from that abreast of the town; while some of their surfaces present large and smooth inclined planes, at an angle of 45° to the horizon. But so little uniformity is observed, that the dips are found at all angles and in all directions; and, at one place, an eastern and western dip not only lie within a few yards' distance, but their projecting extremities actually come into contact.

At the eastern extremity of the "Kinkell braes," about 2½ miles from the town, and close upon the sea-side, are some remarkable rocks; one of which is named the "Spindle Rock," from its having a perpendicular pinnacle like a distaff at one end, and a basaltic crystallization resembling the spokes of a wheel at the other.

The only shells to be met with at St Andrews of any importance, are—of univalves, the pelican's foot; and

of bivalves, the razor-shell and the pholas. The first two are cast ashore on the west sands, destitute of their inhabitants; but the folus, with its living inmate, must be dug out of the calmstone in which it forms its habitat.

Fine specimens of red sea-weed are found here, which have a very beautiful appearance when immersed in water and then spread upon paper, with all their delicate and minute leaves expanded.

Immediately abreast of the town, are numerous long reaches or lakes, separated from each other by parallel ridges of sandstone rock, cropping out to the northwest. These are the regular strata already mentioned as giving a peculiar feature to the coast: only that, in this case, they are covered by the sea at high tide; and their formation is evidently caused by the intermediate soft strata having been gradually washed away by the action of the waves.

There is a tradition (and it is even asserted in Lyell's Geology as a fact) that these rocky ridges were once uncovered by the sea, and formed an extensive meadow; from which some have concluded that the sea is encroaching upon the town. The above tradition rests on the authority of Martine, author of the "Reliquiæ divi Andreæ," who, in 1683, wrote that there were old men then alive, who remembered the fact. But there is nothing so little to be depended upon as what old men are said to have remembered, especially if it relate to the marvellous. In this case we possess evidence against the truth of the tradition: for, in both the plans of the city I have already referred to, the sea is represented as coming as close up to the rocky eminence on which the city stands, as it does at present. In regard to the encroachment of the sea, it is true that the castle wall on the east has been washed down; but this has been owing to its

gradual decay, combined with the violence of the waves at high tides during easterly winds; and where the rocks themselves have given way, it seems to have arisen from their own decomposition. If any other proof of this were wanting, it is afforded by the following mandate, issued by James de Bane bishop of St Andrews early in the fourteenth century. It will be seen from it, that the sea came as close up to the precipitous rock on the north side of the cathedral as it does at this day, and that there was even more danger apprehended from it at that time than there is at present. The document is curious in itself, independent of the geological fact which it establishes:—

"To all the faithful in Christ who shall see or hear of these presents, James de Bane, by divine permission, the humble minister of the Church of St Andrews, *salutem in salutis auctore.* We have learnt from the report of our beloved sons, the Prior and Convent of St Andrews, that some persons, preferring their private advantage to that of the public, and not looking forward to future dangers, break off and carry away stones from the rock next the sea on the north side of our cathedral church; by doing which, unless some remedy be applied, there will be reason to fear a serious injury to the foundation, and, by consequence, the total destruction of the church at some future time, which God forbid! We, therefore, anxious to prevent the said danger, and to uphold our said church as far as possible, have, with the consent of our chapter, resolved to forbid any one to break stones from the said rock, or to remove those already broken off, either by the waves of the sea or by the hand of violence; and this under the penalty of 100 *solidi* to be paid towards the fabric of the church, and also under pain of excommunication, which, from this time, we, by these presents, direct against all and every one who shall disobey this

our mandate. In testimony of which we have affixed our seal hereunto. Given at Inchmurtah[1] on the first Sunday after Easter, in the year of our Lord one thousand three hundred and thirty."

Notwithstanding this wise precaution, it would appear that the danger from the sea continued to exist; for, within forty-two years of the above date, we find a reference to the same subject by no less a personage than the Roman Pontiff, Gregory XI. Bishop Landel had granted to the Prior and Canons of St Andrews the great tithes of the church of Inchsture, one of his own mensal churches, to be applied to the express purpose of fencing the above-mentioned rock from the violence of the sea. The prior and his brethren, to make sure of this grant, applied to the reigning Pope to confirm it; and the following is a translation of the bull which he issued in consequence. I shall give it entire.

"Gregorius, episcopus, &c., to our beloved sons the Prior and Chapter of St Andrews in Scotland, &c.—Seeing your petition, lately presented unto us, contained that our venerable brother William bishop of St Andrews, fearing that, from the violence of the sea beating against the rock on which the church of St Andrews is situated, (a great part of which rock the continual action of the waves had demolished, so that the foundation and superstructure of the said church were threatened with total ruin,) and seeing that the rents and revenues appropriated to the upholding of the fabric were insufficient, on account of the wars and pestilences in those parts, to protect the rock and sustain the church; and the said bishop being desirous, as a provision against such danger, to grant the parish

[1] Inchmurtah, now better known by the vulgar name of Smiddy Green, is a few miles south-east of St Andrews. The bishops had a residence there, beautifully situated on the bank of the Pitmilly burn. Not a stone of it remains.

church of Inchsture, with its chapel of Kinnaird, situated in the diocese of St Andrews, being one of the mensal churches belonging to him and his predecessors, and which he then peaceably possessed with all its rights and pertinents; he accordingly, with the advice and consent of certain jurists, gave and bestowed the same in perpetuity on the said church of St Andrews. But as your petition to us contains that you doubt whether a grant of this kind may hold good in time coming, and that you may hereafter possibly be molested in regard to it: therefore we, moved by your prayers, and anxious, as far as possible, to provide against this danger, will, and by our apostolical authority permit, that you retain the aforesaid parish of Inchsture, with its chapel and other pertinents, for a period of twenty years, reckoning from the date of these presents; and that you apply the same to the upholding of the said church of St Andrews: Provided always, that you take care that the said parish church of Inchsture be not thereby defrauded of its dues, and that the cure of its souls be not neglected; but that it be served by a good and sufficient vicar, who shall receive an adequate portion of its revenues for his maintenance. Therefore, let no one infringe this our decree, &c.—Given at Avignon, Id. April., the second year of our pontificate."—(A.D. 1372.)[1]

It was little imagined by our predecessors of that age, who showed so laudable an anxiety to uphold our metropolitan cathedral, that the rude hands of reforming violence would in the end prove a far more formidable enemy to it than even the angry waves of the ocean.

To return to the subject of the encroaching sea: My own opinion is, that at the period in question, the tide,

[1] The original is in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

when full, rose higher than it does now, which, of course, would increase the danger to be apprehended from it. This opinion is founded upon the fact, elsewhere established,[1] that there was then a *salina*, or salt manufactory, at the foot of the ridge on which the neighbouring farm of Balgove is situated; from which fact it must be concluded that the sea covered our links at full tide, and, consequently, rose three or four feet higher than it does at present.[2] This will also account for the celebrity of St Andrews as a *shipping port* during the middle ages, which it cannot now be, for want of water. In fact, there are numerous proofs everywhere, that the sea rose considerably above its present level at the period in question; or, as some think, (and which would equally account for the phenomenon referred to,) that the land has risen in the same proportion, either from the combined action of the currents and the waves, or from the effects of volcanic commotions. The line of coast between the Eden and the Tay, as well as on the opposite side of the St Andrews' bay, exhibits the very same appearance as with us. A few feet above the high-water mark, are extensive plains, or undulating links; and beyond them is the ancient sea-beach, sloping up to about fifty feet above them. There are even thought to be distinct traces of several successive raised beaches, which may have been caused by as many recessions of the sea, or upheavings of the land, at remote periods. These were, probably, at one time, marked by precipitous banks or cliffs; but they are now gradually softened down by the action of the weather and intersecting rivulets, so as to be rendered capable of tillage. But, on this difficult and controverted subject, I do not hazard an opinion.

[1] Appendix, VI. 144, 315, 422.

[2] See, also, in p. 395 of the same Appendix, another confirmation of this opinion.

Notwithstanding that the land has gained upon the sea, since the fourteenth century, there is now a reaction slowly going forward. The town is amply protected by the rocky eminence on which it stands; but the links, which consist of nothing but sandy hillocks, have, within the last fifty years, yielded nearly as many yards to the gradually-advancing ocean.

CHAPTER II.

Traditional Origin and Early History of the City.

The following is Martine's account of the supposed origin of St Andrews, as extracted from his Reliquiæ Divi Andriæ.[1]

"Some conjecture that the grand and chief occasion of the Pights their generall and nationall turning to Christianitie from Heathenisme, was as follows. One Regulus, a Greek monk, living at Patræ, a city of Achaia, by whom the relicts of St Andrew the Apostle were preserved and kept, about the year 307 was warned in a vision by night, (three nights before the Emperor Constantine came to the citie with a purpose to translate these relicts to Constantinople,) to goe to the shrine in which they were kept, and to take out thereof the arm-bone, three fingers of the right hand, a tooth, and one of the lids of the Apostle's knees, which he should carefullie preserve and carrie with him to a region towards the west, situate in the utmost parts of the world. Regulus, at first troubled with

[1] Martine was secretary to Archbishop Sharp. He borrows this account chiefly from Fordun's Scotichronicon.

the strangeness of the vision, after a little time resolved to obey. So, putting the relicts in a little box, he went to sea, taking compartners with him, Damianus a priest, Gelasius and Tubaculus[1] two deacons, eight heremites, and three devoted virgins, whose names are expressed in sundry ancient records, says Fordun in the Scotichronicon, lib. ii.

"After they had, with much toyle and hazard, passed through the Mediterranean Sea, they coasted along France and Spain, and after long travell fell into the Germaine Ocean, where they were long tossed with greivous tempests: till at last, by force of a storm, the ship was driven into the bay near the place where St Andrews now stands, and there split asunder on the rocks. But Regulus and his companions were all brought safe to shore, having nothing left but the relicts, which they were carefull above all things to preserve.

"The fame of their arrival, and of the relicts they had brought with them, being spread abroad, many of the Pights (in whose kingdom they had settled at the place now called St Andrews) resorted to them; some for devotion, others for curiosity. And amongst them, Hergustus, King of the Pights for the time, and who then had dominion of that part of the countrie, coming hither, when he beheld the gravitie and pietie of the men, and the form of their service, was so taken therewith, that he settled a constant abode for them in the same place, and took order for their entertainment. The place was then a forest for wild boars, and was

[1] The well-known Thomas Dempster, who never mentions a Scottish saint without informing his readers of the various works which he left behind, tells us of those written by Regulus, Damianus, Gelasius, and Tubaculus, and even gives the names of such of them as are or were extant!—*Hist. Eccl. Gen. Scot.*, lib. iii. *in locis*. *E. g.* Regulus wrote, "Monita Divina de Transferendis S. Andreæ Reliquiis in Albionem." Gelasius, "De Nativitate Christi." Tubaculus, "Conciones ad Populum," &c. It may fairly be questioned if such works ever existed.

called, in the countrie language, *Muceross*—*i. e.* "a land of boars"—from *muc*, a sow, and *ross*, a land or island. Shortly after, Hergustus gave to Regulus and his company all the lands of that forest, with all the men dwelling therein, and his own palace, (says Spotswood and Leslie:) and near thereto erected a church, the same church (with the steeple yet entire) we see a pairt yet remaining on the south-east side of the ruined cathedral, (built many years after,) called to this day the church of St Rewle.

"Here did Regulus and his company abide; himself living thirtie-two years after his arrival, serving God devotedlie; and for their austeritie of life, were in great reputation with all men. And the good and holie lives of Regulus, his companions and their successors, living in cells at St Rewle's church, was the occasion, and proved the effectual meane, both for the kindly reception and good opinion, veneration, and entertainment of the Christian religion and these religious men, amongst that bloody, savage, and barbarous people the Pights."

Boethius, who takes up the narrative after the arrival of Regulus, thus expresses himself on the same subject:—"Here matters were conducted in a most Christian manner by Hergustus; for he liberally bestowed on St Andrew, and on Regulus and his followers, his palace, encompassed with spacious buildings. Near this palace he constructed a holy temple, and dedicated it to St Andrew. This is said to be the same venerable church which we still see in the middle of the cemetery of the canons, filled with ancient monuments, yet without names. A former age called this *Kilrule*, that is, the church of St Regulus: but more recently it has been named that of St Andrew. This church Hergustus adorned with numerous gifts, with goblets, bowls, chalices, basins, and ewers, all of gold or silver, with many

other valuable offerings for the use of the priests in their performance of the divine offices. The example of Hergustus was followed by a long line of Pictish kings, and afterwards of Scottish kings, who came in their place; and who, moreover, adopted St Andrew as the tutelary patron of their country."

There can be no doubt that St Andrew's relics were held in great and early veneration. We are told, on good authority, that various small portions of them were distributed among the churches of Milan, Nola, and Brescia. "That Regulus did bring with him such relics," says Spotswood, "is not improbable; for in those times, Christians did hold the bones and relics of martyrs in a respectful manner; which doth in no sort justify the abuses which afterwards crept into the church, when from the keeping of relics they grew to worship and adore them." (P. 7.) The narrative, of some of those of St Andrew having been brought here, was universally and unhesitatingly believed. The foundation, which in after-times became the College of St Leonards, had been originally an hospital for the entertainment of pilgrims, who resorted hither purposely to adore these relics.[1] This institution is often alluded to in the bulls and charters of the twelfth century as "the hospital of St Leonards in the city of St Andrews, for the hospitable reception of poor pilgrims," and as then possessing "certain lands, annual rents, and pertinents."

In the Register of the Priory of St Andrews, there are four charters of one of the Malcolms, (probably the fourth,) and three of William, granting certain privileges and properties to the hospital; and Martine, in his "Reliquiæ," gives a copy of some Latin verses, which one of the pilgrims left behind him, inscribed on a votive tablet, of which the following is a translation:—

[1] See the Episcopate of Archbishop A. Stewart, chap. viii.

"This bay and shore of the sea, though rough and boisterous, contains a most fertile country; this region, once poor, foul, and desolate, is now rich, beautiful, and flourishing. Hither come to pray, a crowd of men from the most distant regions—the loquacious Frenchman, the warlike Roman, the Flemish weaver, the uncivilized German, the Englishman, the Saxon, the Hollander, the naked Pict, the savage Angerian; and strangers from the Rhone, the Rhine, and the Tiber, come to seek the prayers of St Andrew. We, too, if our humble name may be noticed among so many, have come to solicit the same favour." It is difficult to conceive how St Andrew could have acquired so great a reputation in this particular spot, and been adopted as our patron saint, in preference to the other apostles, and our own indigenous saints, but for some such cause as that assigned by Fordun and other early writers.[1] We may, at least, infer, that there must have been a very peculiar veneration for the present site of the city, when a place, which is so much in a corner, and must have been so difficult of access, was fixed upon for the ecclesiastical metropolis of Scotland. Our ancestors seem to have believed too much; and we, in this enlightened age, certainly believe too little.

As every subject which Sir Walter Scott touches, whether fact or fiction, derives a charm from the magic of his pen, it may not be amiss to remind the reader

[1] It is recorded of the late Lord Byron, that when he visited the battle-field of Morat, where 30,000 Swiss defeated 40,000 Burgundians, he carried away with him some of the bones of the former; "which bones," says the narrator, "he designed to preserve with *the most religious care*." If this feeling were natural, it was surely an *a fortiori* one to preserve the relics of St Andrew. Piety and usefulness were formerly venerated; *now* it is courage and talent, without the least reference to the religion or the virtue of the individual. Even the relics of *infidels* are sometimes sought after by Christians, who ridicule the idea of preserving those of *saints!*

of what the Palmer in the poem of "Marmion" tells that nobleman :—

> But I have solemn vows to pay,
> And may not linger by the way,
> To fair St Andrews bound ;
> Within the ocean-cave to pray,
> Where good St Rule his holy lay,
> From midnight to the dawn of day,
> Sung to the billows' sound ;

and to quote the following note which the poet appends :—"St Regulus (*Scottice*, St Rule,) a monk of Patræ in Achaia, warned by a vision, is said, A.D. 307, to have sailed westward until he landed at St Andrews in Scotland, where he founded a chapel and tower. The latter is still standing ; and though we may doubt the precise date of its foundation, it certainly is one of the most ancient edifices in Scotland. A cave, nearly fronting the ruinous castle of the Archbishop of St Andrews, bears the name of this religious person. It is difficult of access, and the rock in which it is hewn is washed by the German Ocean. It is nearly round, about ten feet in diameter, and the same in height. On one side is a sort of stone altar ; on the other, an aperture into an inner den, where the miserable ascetic [why miserable?] who inhabited this dwelling, probably slept. At full tide, egress and regress are hardly practicable. As Regulus first colonized the metropolitan see of Scotland, and converted the inhabitants in the vicinity, he has some reason to complain that the ancient name of Kilrule (*cella Reguli*) should have been superseded even in favour of the tutelary saint of Scotland. The reason of the change was, that St Rule is said to have brought to Scotland the relics of St Andrew."

The saint, doubtless, never was so selfish as to wish to derogate from the honour of the Apostle ; but the former has not been forgotten, for to this day the tower abovementioned bears his name. As to the cave, it is com-

monly known as "Lady Buchan's cave," from the circumstance of that lady's having occasionally used it for a very different purpose to what the recluse devoted it, namely, for entertaining her friends in it *at tea*, when she resided here, some eighty years ago, with her two sons, the late Lord Chancellor Erskine and his brother.

The next occurrence connected with the early history of St Andrews (and which, like the story of St Regulus, is possibly a compound of truth and fable) is thus related by Fordun:—In the beginning of the ninth century, Hungus, king of the Picts, to which nation Fife still belonged, made war upon Athelstane, a Saxon (or, as some say, a Danish) prince of Northumberland, and ravaged his dominions. When he was returning home, laden with spoil, he was unexpectedly overtaken by Athelstane near Haddington, and surrounded by a superior force. In this state of danger, he prayed earnestly to God and the saints, especially to St Andrew, vowing that he would bestow upon the latter the tenth of all his dominions if he were delivered from his enemies. The same night the apostle appeared to him, and thus addressed him:—"God, the ruler of all things, hearing the humble prayer which thou has offered up through me, will to-morrow give thee an easy victory over thy enemies, and will cause his angel to bear my holy cross before thine army. When, therefore, thou returnest home in safety, be mindful of thy vow, and delay not to fulfil what thou hast so liberally promised." The king, awaking from his sleep, told the vision to his whole army, who were, in consequence, so inspired with courage and confidence, that they immediately made a furious attack upon their enemies, most of whom they put to flight, and killed King Athelstane with all his attendants. Hungus cut off Athelstane's head, fixed it on the end of a spear, and placed it on the top of a rock in Inchgarvie, an island near Queensferry, in me-

mory of the miraculous victory he had won; and then proceeded to the church of St Andrews, where he religiously performed his vow.

The following is Wyntoun's account of this affair, which differs slightly from that of Fordun. These two authors were contemporary, yet unknown to each other.

After that natyvity
That was matter of our glee,
Aucht hundyr wynter and twenty,
(A wheen[1] more or less, but few thereby,)
Hungus the kyng of Pichtis then
Fought against Athelstane,
By Sanct Andrew, spiritually,
Wha comforted hym rycht highly;
And won hym by force in fecht,
And brought hym with all hys micht
'Til A'lstane ford, by Haddyngtoun,
And made hym accusatioun
That he did a great despyte
'Til hys men, and na condyte[2]
Wuld hald, nor keep to them hys fay[3]
Whyle prysoned with hym were they.
So, for hys great falsehed,
There he gart strike off hys head,
And on a spear gart highly
Then bear it to Queensferry.
Upon that crag he gart but let[4]
That head upon a stake be set,
Then forth in hys devotioun
Added the dotatioun
Of Sanct Andrewys kyrk in fee,
With landis in regality.
Syne Sanct Andrewys relics there,
With honour great ressaved were.[5]

Hardynge, who was contemporary with Wyntoun and Fordun, tells us the same story in his Chronicle, but seems to confound Hungus with Hergustus, who, we

[1] A number. [2] Safe-conduct. [3] Faith.

[4] "But let," without delay.

[5] Vol. i. p. 167. In all my quotations from this ancient chronicler, I have *slightly* modernized the spelling, to make it more intelligible to those readers who are unaccustomed to the old Anglo-Saxon. Wyntoun, as I have mentioned in the Preface, was a canon of the Augustinian priory of St Andrews, and wrote about A.D. 1390–1410.

have seen, lived in the time of Regulus. But it gives additional interest to his relation when he informs us, that he had been himself at St Andrews, and saw the relics of the apostle. Speaking of "Ungust" (by whom we must understand Hungus,) he says—

> ——— where by his relacioun,
> He founded there a mynster of his fundacion,
> Of Saynt Andrewe, where his bones shryned have been,
> As there in dede I was, and have it seen.[1]

Thus far Fordun, Wyntoun, and Hardynge. Sibbald quotes from an old "Register of St Andrews," a document to show that the land with which Hungus endowed the church of St Andrews, comprehended all that part of Fife which is bounded by the Forth and the Tay, and a line drawn from Largo through Cupar to Naughton; and that the king conferred this gift by the ceremony of a turf brought from that land, and laid on the altar of the church, in the presence of his nobles and several of the royal family. This, if correct, seems a prodigious grant to one church; but, perhaps, it was no more than the tithe of the produce; and that would not be very large, if we consider the thinness of the population at that period, the rude state of agriculture, and the difficulty, as well as uncertainty, of collecting the tithes. Boethius adds, that, on the occasion of making this grant, Hungus, and all his nobles, repairing to the church, and approaching the altar on their bare knees, devoutly kissed the relics of the Apostle, and rendered their grateful thanks for the victory he had given them; and not only so, but that the king bestowed, besides, upon the church the images of

[1] Chronicle, p. 183. Hardynge probably came to St Andrews at the desire of his friend the celebrated Hotspur, in order to get the assistance of the Scottish chiefs against Henry IV. This would be at the very beginning of the fifteenth century.

Christ and his apostles in gold and silver, with a case of beaten gold in which to enclose the relics of St Andrew; and enacted, farther, that spiritual persons should not be compelled to answer for their crimes before any temporal judge.

Of all these gifts and immunities, however, Feredith, the third in succession from Hungus, thought proper to rob the church, which was believed by many to be the reason why divine providence decreed not only his own violent death, but the whole nation of the Picts to be soon after exterminated by the Scots. But so it was, that the latter, under their king Kenneth II., did vanquish, and almost annihilate the Picts, in the middle of the ninth century. The conquerors, profiting by the warning afforded them, or out of gratitude for their success, restored to the church the whole of what had belonged to it, acknowledged St Andrew as their national patron, and decreed the place which bore his name, to be from that time the permanent seat of a bishop, and the ecclesiastical metropolis of their kingdom.

Before that era, according to Fordun, Abernethy, now a small village in Strathern, was the metropolis of the Southern Picts; for there not only had their king his palace, but their chief bishop his episcopal see; and even in the eleventh century, the same place could still boast of its "schools."[1] A monastery had been founded there so early as the sixth century; for, after mentioning king Brude, who lived at that period, Wyntoun adds—

> Garnock Makdormoch neist him syne
> Was kyng, and founded Abernethyne
> In Strath-hern, in that tyde,
> Intil the honour of Sanct Bryde.

[1] Register of the Priory of St Andrews, p. 116. Appendix VI. See also, the Episcopate of Bishop Wardlaw, chap. vii.

The first tyme may be wotted here,
Converted when the Pictis were. [1]

This part of Pictish history is, however, involved in much obscurity.

CHAPTER III.

The Culdees.

At the period now under our review the Christians in Scotland were distinguished by the name of Culdees.[2] They had a religious establishment at St Andrews, which, in all probability, was the seat of a bishop from a very early age. At least, we know that this was the case in most of the other Scottish sees, before they were erected into fixed dioceses, and endowed with temporalities.

The Culdean establishment here was the monastery of Kirkheugh, and was situated on the hill which overhangs the harbour, eastward of the cathedral. It was called "Ecclesia Sanctæ Mariæ de Rupe," or St Mary's church of the rock; either from its being founded upon a rock, or from a chapel belonging to it said to have been built on one called the "Lady Craig," near the extremity of the present pier. The Culdees possessed this monastery for several hundred years. They consisted of an abbot and twelve priests, who were gen-

[1] Vol i. p. 125.

[2] The name Culdee is derived from the Gaelic *gille-De*, which signifies "God's servant." There is an evident affinity between this and the *cultores Dei* of the Latin; and the same affinity has been remarked between many other Latin and Gaelic words.

erally married men,[1] and whose sons often succeeded them in their office. Whether their marriage were a part of their original institution, or a deviation from it, is a question which it would be foreign to my purpose to investigate, since the practice is admitted to have existed among them during at least the tenth and eleventh centuries, the period with which we are chiefly concerned.

What connexion these Culdees had with St Regulus and his followers, cannot be known with certainty;[2] but there seems every reason for believing that the name of Culdees was bestowed on the indigenous clergy of the country from the time it was Christianized. Their lives and doctrines are said to have been pure; and, if they derived this purity from their early intercourse with the missionaries of the Roman see, there is reason to think that they retained it, in several particulars, after that Church had departed from it: nor was it without difficulty that she succeeded, at a subsequent period, in establishing her supremacy over them, and finally incorporating them with herself.

There can be no doubt that there was a very general deference yielded to Rome, from an early period, by

[1] It is well known that Bethoc, daughter of Malcolm II., married the Culdean abbot of Dunkeld:—

> When that thus all hys days was done
> Efter hym he left na son,
> But a dochter, Bethoc fair,
> He left of kind to be hys heir.
> She was to Criney in her lyfe
> The abbot of Dunkeldynis wyfe.
>
> *Wyntoun*, vol. i. p. 135.

From this marriage sprung Duncan, the ancestor of the royal family of Scotland. The abbot of Dunkeld was a man of great wealth and political importance in that age. Edeldradus, son of Malcolm III., afterwards assumed this office.

[2] Sir R. Sibbald's "History of Fife," p. 241.

the European churches, and that some advantages resulted to the latter from the connexion. Even the Scottish Christians, though so remote from the imperial city, (they who had become subject to Christ, whom the Romans could not subdue—"Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita,") had experienced the benefits of this religious intercourse. Our Saint Ninian had gone to Rome to seek consecration from Pope Sericius so early as A.D. 394; and, having returned, founded the bishopric of Galloway, and preached to the inhabitants of that district. Soon after, Celestine I. sent Palladius as a missionary bishop to preach the Gospel to our forefathers.[1] Wyntoun tells us that—

> This Celestine, pape of Rome
> And keeper of all Chrystendome,
> Sent Sanct Patryck in Ireland,
> And Sanct Pallady in Scotland,
> In these landis for to preach,
> And men in Chrysten fay to teach.

Spotswood says of Palladius, "that he was a Grecian by birth; learned, moderate, and singularly wise, as appeared in all his actions; and did purge the Church from those errors, (meaning the Pelagian heresy,) and won such love and credit, as, by the space of twenty-four years, he governed all ecclesiastical affairs in these parts, without any grudge or opposition." About two hundred years after, there came an Italian, named Boniface, from Rome, who also, like his predecessor, confined himself to his office of a Christian

[1] Such, at least, is the common, and, I believe, the correct opinion. But Pinkerton and Archbishop Usher argue that the *Scoti* of that age were, in fact, the Irish; and that Palladius was sent to Ireland, and not to Scotland. It is admitted, however, that he came afterwards to Scotland, died there, and was buried at Fordun in the Mearns. See Alban Butler's "Lives of the Saints," under July 6th.

missionary, founded the churches of Tealing, Restenneth, and Rosemarkie, and was very useful in spreading the Gospel among our rude forefathers, but aimed at no authority over them beyond what his personal character and influence naturally produced.

In evidence that the Culdees did not, at this period, acknowledge the supremacy of Rome, it may be here stated that, in the year 816, the Anglo-Saxon council of Caelchithe (which, we know, was wholly Roman Catholic) issued a canon prohibiting all priests of the Scottish nation from performing sacred offices in any of the English dioceses, particularly baptism, the mass, and the eucharist,[1] "because," they add, "we are ignorant whence and from whom they have derived ordination, (unde et an ab aliquo ordinentur.) and it is forbidden by the canons, that any bishop or presbyter should intrude into the province of another, without his express permission; and the ministrations of the Scottish clergy are the more objectionable, because they acknowledge no metropolitan as their head." Now, while this proves the great care taken by the English Church to maintain the episcopal succession unbroken, it also seems to prove that the Roman authority did not, at that time, extend to Scotland; otherwise it is clear that the Scottish ordinations would have been recognised by their brethren of the Anglo-Roman church.

The Culdees seem to have acknowledged as their ecclesiastical head, for several centuries, the celebrated Abbot of Iona, who, though only a presbyter, by a somewhat unusual practice, ("ordine inusitato," says Bede,) exercised a sort of primacy over the Christians of a great part of Scotland, and even of Ireland.[2] He is

[1] Cap. 5. Ut Scoti non admittendi sacra ministrare.

[2] The monastery of Iona was their great missionary college, where young men were educated for the church; and whence, when qualified,

also said to have had a supremacy in some respects over bishops, (cujus juri ipsi etiam episcopi debeant esse subjecti:) but if so, it could only be *quoad civilia*, or over those who lived in his monastery; just as in England, at this day, the dean of a chapter, though only a presbyter, is superior to all the prebendaries in his cathedral church, though there may be a bishop or bishops among them. And in confirmation of this view of the matter, it is mentioned by Hardynge, in his Chronicle, p. 171, that Hilda the *abbess* of Whitby in the year 670, had no less than *six* bishops dwelling in her convent at one time, who, while there, were, no doubt, subject to her authority. But as a proof that the abbots of Iona submitted to their bishops in spiritual things, we are told by Adamnan, in his Life of St Columba the first abbot of that monastery, that he would never consecrate the eucharist in the presence of a bishop—thus acknowledging his inferiority to that order, *quoad spiritualia*. In truth, the very fact of there being bishops among the Culdees, is a proof that they were required for the performance of certain functions to which mere presbyters were incompetent, —one of the most important of which was, the ordination of these presbyters themselves; for they were never so designated, nor could they perform any presbyterial duty, till they had been episcopally ordained.

But, for whatever length of time the Culdees acknow-

they proceeded, not only to the Islands and Highlands of Scotland, but to Ireland and to still more distant countries. Their efforts were attended with astonishing success; yet, unlike our modern missionaries, they needed no pecuniary subscriptions. "They lived in the most plain and frugal manner, supporting themselves by the labour of their hands. Except some cattle, they had no wealth; if they got any money from the rich, they immediately gave it to the poor. When they travelled the road, people ran to them to get their blessing; and when they went to any village, (which they did only when they had occasion to preach, baptize, or visit the sick,) crowds gathered to hear them. In short, the care of souls was their only concern."—See Smith's interesting Life of St Columba, (the first abbot of Iona,) p. 55.

ledged the supremacy of the Abbot of Iona, they were destined, in the end, to transfer their allegiance to the Bishop of Rome. Indeed, situated as they were, they could hardly do otherwise. All the rest of Europe had, by this time, submitted to the popedom; and though, from their remote situation, they might have hoped to retain their independence, yet various circumstances concurred to bring them within the vortex of the same influence. Macbeth, their king, and a great benefactor to their church, undertook a pilgrimage to Rome; his successor, Malcolm III., married a Roman Catholic princess; and their son Edgar, established a monastery of Benedictine monks at Coldingham. But even then, whatever authority might be *claimed* by the pontiff, there does not appear to have been any generally *yielded* by this country till the reign of David I. The learned and accurate Pinkerton has demonstrated, that the first legate that ever appeared in Scotland was John of Crema, in the year 1125;[1] before which time there is no trace to be met with of any papal authority in Scotland.

The Culdees had at least five considerable establishments in Fife—namely, Abernethy, St Andrews, Dunfermline, St Serf's Island in Lochleven, and Kirkcaldy.[2] But indeed they spread themselves over a great part of Scotland, as is indicated by the number of places which still retain the names of their most eminent saints.[3]

[1] "Enquiry," vol. ii. p. 270.

[2] The name Kirkcaldy is corrupted from Kirk-*Culdee*.

[3] For example:—St Marnoch, about A.D. 352; St Ninian, or Ringan, first bishop of Galloway, about 400; St Patrick, (a native of Scotland,) 435; St Fergus, 505; St Colme, or Columba, 565; St Mungo, or Kentigern, first bishop of Glasgow, 578; St Serf, 580; St Mun, 600; St Ronan, 603; St Fillan, 649; St Finnan, 674. Few are aware how much, under God, our country is indebted to the pious labours of these indefatigable men. Some of their names were inserted in the calendar of the Scottish liturgy of 1637, as commemorative of their piety and virtue; and this was one of the causes of its scornful rejection by the fanatics of that period.

Like all the early Christians, they had, no doubt, their canonically consecrated bishops, the limits of whose dioceses are said to have been, not an arbitrary extent of territory around their monasteries, but the boundaries of the thane or baron under whose protection they lived. Latterly, however, these dioceses became better defined; and their revenues, which consisted at first of the voluntary offerings of the faithful, were soon recognised as legal property. The first established diocese was Galloway or *Candida Casa;* the second was probably that of St Mungo or Glasgow, and the third St Andrews. "All our writers," says Pinkerton, "ancient and modern, concur that St Andrews was the most ancient bishopric north of the Clyde and Forth." As these and other bishopries began under the auspices of the Culdees, the office of electing persons to fill them naturally devolved upon them; and this privilege they exercised for many ages. In fact, the bishop was generally one of their own body, and continued to live in the same monastery with his brethren, till he got a cathedral, a fixed diocese, and an episcopal residence for himself.

It appears from the Register of the Priory of St Andrews, that the early bishops of this see, as well as several kings and noblemen, were extremely liberal to the Culdees of St Andrews, Lochleven, and Monymusk, and gave them lands and cattle, tithes, tenements, and books.[1] The indulgence with which they were treated continued till the time of David I., who, in the beginning of his reign, also treated them with respect, but afterwards gradually changed in his behaviour towards them, in proportion as he became subject to Roman influence. He told the Culdees of Lochleven, that if they chose to live peaceably, and be submissive to their

[1] Among these benefactors we find Macbeth and his queen, Malcolm III. and his queen, together with their son Edgar. Ibid. pp. 114, 115.

new masters, the Augustinian prior and canons-regular of St Andrews, they might do so; but if they proved refractory, they were to be expelled from their monastery.[1] After this, the popes, as well as the kings and bishops of Scotland, seem to have entered into a kind of compact to check the farther progress of Culdeeism, and to substitute the Romish orders of monks in their place. A series of popes, from Eugenius III. in 1147, down to Honorius III. in 1216, in their bulls, addressed to the Prior and Canons of St Andrews, direct that "the regular canons should succeed to the Culdees who deceased, and that the goods and tenements of the latter should be appropriated to the use of the former." In the Register of the Priory, p. 318, is a document, entituled, "Conventio inter nos et Kelledeos de Sancto Andrea," (the date of which, from the witnesses' names, must be about the year 1200,) wherein the canons had put in a claim to certain tithes in Fife, which, it is evident, had originally belonged to the Culdees. They make a show of a fair investigation into the rights of the respective parties, but end with taking to themselves a large share of the disputed property. In the Monymusk charters,[2] of which there are several in the Register, we perceive the gradual change of language adopted, when speaking of the inmates of the monastery at that place. They are first mentioned as "Culdees," then as "Canons *or* Culdees," next as "Canons who are *called* Culdees." At this stage of their condition, Malvoisin bishop of St Andrews, tells them, that *he* will appoint their abbot, out of three of their number named by themselves, but requires them to take an oath of fidelity to him as their ecclesiastical head; and as to their possessions, he allows them to keep what they then had, but forbids

[1] Register, p. 183.

[2] Ibid. p. 362-374.

them to add to them without his permission. In the Dunfermline charters,[1] there is mention of a dispute between the Prior and Canons of St Andrews on the one side, and the Culdees of the same place on the other. This was settled in the parish church of Inverkeithing, by command of Pope Innocent IV., in the year 1250, before certain judges. The Culdees, as might be expected, were condemned for "manifest contumacy;" and their sentence, which is not recorded, was directed to be proclaimed in the church of the Friars-Predicant at Perth. Yet it is important to observe, that the pope, in the same year, issued a bull in favour of these very Culdees, "saving the rights and privileges of the Prior and Canons of St Andrews," which would lead us to suppose that they themselves acknowledged their subjection to his holiness.[2] But the measure which led to their annihilation, consisted in their being deprived of the privilege of electing the bishop of the diocese. This privilege they had exercised from time immemorial; and they did not give it up without a struggle, nor finally till the end of the thirteenth century. But the bishopries had, in the mean time, become more valuable, the competitors for them were more numerous, and the Culdees were every year decreasing in number and in strength; and hence it is not to be wondered at that they should be forced, in the end, to let go their hold on this important right. The kings of Scotland, besides, naturally wished to secure this patronage to themselves; the popes, in their turn, were desirous to fill the bishopries with men who would be subservient to their views; and the chapters of the cathedrals, who had by this time partially, as they soon after wholly, displaced the Culdees, thought they were best entitled to exercise the rights

[1] See No. 19 of my Abridgment of these documents, Appendix VII.
[2] Ibid. No. 20.

of their predecessors, the more so as these rights had been conveyed to them by papal bulls.[1] This state of things gave rise, as we shall see in the sequel, to frequent contests between these rival bodies, in which sometimes the king, sometimes the pope, and less frequently the canons prevailed; but in which the unfortunate Culdees always came off worst; till at length, in the case of St Andrews, they wholly lost the power of election in the year 1298, (see the Episcopate of Bishop Lamberton, chap. VI.); and, from that time, ceased to have any existence as an independent body. Their monastery of Kirkheugh became a collegiate church for a Romish provost and twelve prebendaries; while those of Lochleven and Monymusk were filled with canons of the order of St Augustine. Similar changes, about the same time, occurred in their other monasteries in Scotland; and thus their ancient name and distinguishing character gradually merged into, and was finally absorbed by Roman Catholicism.

As I have mentioned that the first bishops and priests of Scotland obtained the name of Culdees, I will finish this Chapter with a few particulars relative to this interesting and controverted subject.

It is important to remark, that the Culdee bishops exercised their functions long before they possessed those territorial limits which subsequently became the established dioceses of Scotland. From not attending to this fact, an anti-Episcopal writer[2] attempts to show that, in the reign of Malcolm III., the Scottish bishops could not be consecrated by three of their own order, as the Council of Nice required, because there was scarcely that number in Scotland: whereas, in point of fact, at no subsequent period did Scotland possess so many bishops as she did then, and for many ages

[1] Register, p. 67.
[2] Sir James Dalrymple's "Collections," pp. 236, 249.

before. There was scarcely a monastery which did not possess one: sometimes there were two in a monastery; at other times the abbot himself was a bishop. Keith, in his "Catalogue of Scottish Saints," gives the names of thirty bishops, distinguished for their uncommon sanctity, who all flourished before the eleventh century. In the Register of the Priory we find incidental mention of two bishops, Brudadh, and Slogadadh, in the time of David I., who certainly belonged to no fixed dioceses: and in another document of the same volume, we read of a bishop of Strathern,[1] which, as far as we know, was never one of the established bishoprics of the kingdom. The very writer above referred to, quotes a charter, addressed "Episcopo et Kalledeis in ecclesia de Brechin," *before* the erection of that place into a regular see. In the reign of Kenneth III., (A.D. 970–994,) we read of Bishops Blaanus, Englatius, Colmocus, and Moveanus.[2] In the year 721, we read of two bishops from this country subscribing the acts of a council held at Rome—the one named Sedulius, a Scot; the other, Fergustus, a Pict—each of whom takes the designation of "Scotiæ episcopus." At a still earlier age, we find Hilarius, "the archiepiscopal conservator of the privileges of the apostolic see," addressing five Scottish bishops, and five presbyters, by name, on the subject of the proper time of keeping Easter.[3] The venerable Bede quotes a letter from Lawrence, the second archbishop of Canterbury, so early as the year 606—"To the *bishops* and abbots throughout Scotland," on the same subject.[4] Usher, in his "Antiquitates Britannarum Ecclesiarum," tells us of British bishops, (among whom there were, probably, some Scots or Picts,) who, in

[1] Register, pp. 117, 319.
[2] Spotswood, p. 27.
[3] Spotswood, p. 13; Bede, lib. ii. cap. 19.
[4] Bede, lib. ii. p. 4.

the fourth century, took a part in foreign councils; namely, at Sardis, Arimini, and Tours.[1] In the same century, St Palladius, of whom we have before made mention, consecrated St Servanus, and sent him to evangelize the Orcadians; while he, at the same time, consecrated St Tervanus archbishop of the Picts, and despatched him to that people for a similar purpose;[2] not to mention the well-known Scottish bishops, Aidan, Finnan, and Colman, who converted so many of the English to Christianity. These facts tend completely to overthrow an attempt which has been made to prove that the early Christians of Scotland were a sort of *presbyterians*, without bishops, living in a state of *parity*, with an abbot, by way of *moderator*, for their head;[3] a theory not only purely gratuitous, but contradicted by all ecclesiastical history, and repug-

[1] Pp. 195, 196, 422, 661.

[2] Ibid. p. 673. In Ireland, bishops were both earlier and more numerous than in Scotland. The bishops of Armagh are traced chronologically from St Patrick, in A.D. 445, in regular succession downward.

[3] Dr Burns of Paisley, the editor of Wodrow's Church History, though wedded to Presbyterianism, makes this unconscious admission, in his "Preliminary Dissertation" to the above work:—"Our forefathers held Presbyterianism to be the divinely constituted plan of ecclesiastical polity, and therefore obligatory on every one who regarded the Scriptures as the oracles of Heaven. Even from such an early period as the days of the Culdees, this attachment to Presbyterianism had been characteristic of Scotsmen. In the economy of these venerable fathers, we find that an humble abbot, holding no higher rank than that of a *presbyter*, had *the precedence of bishops*." Dr Burns is not perhaps aware, that at that time, and at all times before the Reformation, a presbyter meant *an episcopally ordained priest;* and until, therefore, he and his brethren become such, they cannot compare themselves to the Culdees. Again, the peculiarity of Presbyterianism is well known to be the *parity* of its ministers; but the Culdees, by Dr Burns' admission, had not only "bishops," but an abbot who had precedence of them, and who, consequently, must have been a bishop of bishops; that is—a primate or archbishop. Therefore the Culdees were *not* "attached to Presbyterianism," or held it to be "the divinely constituted plan of ecclesiastical polity." I have elsewhere explained the true meaning of this supposed superiority of a presbyter to a bishop, p. 30.

nant to the doctrine of the New Testament, which compares Christianity to a kingdom; denoting thereby a visible king or head over visible subjects, with all the intermediate gradations of constituted authorities, which must exist between them; and these subjects never rebellious, or pretending that they are the only source of legitimate power; never presumptuous, or self-willed, or speaking evil of dignities; or saying that "they will not have this man to reign over them," whom divine providence has placed at their head. But that the Culdees were not Presbyterians, is farther evident, from the fact recorded in the Register of the Priory, which we shall have occasion to notice in its proper place, (Chap. IV.,) that the Culdean monks who inhabited the monastery of Lochleven, formally put themselves under the protection of Fothad bishop of St Andrews, about the year 930; and that, moreover, three of Fothad's successors, made grants of property to the same establishment, in virtue of its acknowledged subjection to their government.

In regard to the early introduction of a regular Episcopacy into Scotland, it must, no doubt, be granted, that John Major, in his "De gestis Scotorum," asserts, "that the Scots were instructed in the faith by priests (sacerdotes) and monks, without bishops." But these priests must have been episcopally ordained, otherwise they could not have been priests; nor would Major have so called them. This early instruction in the faith must refer to the second or third century, when Christianity was first introduced into Scotland. As to the particulars, we are almost wholly in the dark; but we know that, from the fifth century, we constantly read of regular bishops: from which it is fair to conclude, that if this country had them not at an earlier age, yet the "priests," who taught the people, had been ordained by foreign bishops, and sent here by

their authority: just as the Church of England sent ordained priests to India, before she had bishops of her own on the spot. And in regard to those who succeeded Palladius, though they were not, for many years, established by law, and were probably without any legal endowment; though they had neither palaces to live in, nor cathedrals to worship in, nor even any fixed dioceses within the limits of which they were restricted, they were not the less bishops on these accounts: their consecrations were not the less canonical, nor their ordinations less valid. But, however this might be, it is to be observed, (in reference to some frivolous objections which have been recently raised to the Scottish Episcopal succession,) that even were the fact otherwise than I have represented it, it could make no possible difference to the Episcopal clergy of Scotland who received their orders, at a subsequent period, through the Anglo-Roman branch of the Western Church.

CHAPTER IV.

Lives and Times of the Bishops of St Andrews, from their Commencement in the Ninth Century till the Death of Bishop Robert, the Founder of the Augustinian Priory, in A.D. 1159, *in whose Episcopate the Supremacy of the Pope was first acknowledged throughout Scotland.*

The diocese of St Andrews, as already mentioned, (p. 25,) was erected by Kenneth Macalpine, the conqueror of the Picts; but whether its limits were the same at first that they became afterwards, cannot be determined. Even so early as the reign of Malcolm

IV., it comprehended the modern counties of Fife, Kinross, and Clackmannan; a part of Perthshire, of Forfarshire, and the Mearns; the three Lothians, Berwickshire, and Roxburghshire. The names, and order of succession of the first bishops of this extensive diocese, vary slightly in different authors. I have selected the account which I consider best authenticated, and most easily reconciled with contemporaneous historical facts.

I. St Adrian, about A.D. 870.

He was killed by the Danes in the Isle of May, along with some other churchmen, in the reign of Constantine II., son of Kenneth I. Boethius gives the following account of this inhuman slaughter, (Lib. x.):—"There were at that time in those parts of Fife, a number of religious men who went about preaching the Christian faith. Many of them were killed by the Danes, though a few escaped by lurking among the caverns. But the greater part, with Adrian, who was then the chief bishop of the Scots, (Scotorum maximus episcopus,) that they might avoid this persecution, fled for refuge to the Isle of May, where there was a famous monastery; but neither the sanctity of the place, nor the innocence of the men, could restrain the fury of the Danes, who burnt the monastery, and cruelly slaughtered its holy inmates. This is that noble band of martyrs which many persons in our times, both in England and Scotland, so highly venerate; so that the Isle of May has been thereby rendered illustrious, both by the number of pilgrims who resort thither, and by the miracles which the goodness of God has superadded. There have come down to us only these few names of this great body of Christians:—Adrianus,

the venerable bishop; Gladianus, or, as some call him, Gaius; Monamus[1] archdeacon of St Andrews; and Stolbrandus, a bishop. The rest of their names, I know not why, have not been preserved." The Breviary of Aberdeen, says that the above slaughter took place in the year 874, and that 6600 persons were put to death. "A great monastery was built of polished stone, in honour of St Adrian, in the Isle of May, the church of which, enriched with his relics, was a place of great devotion."[2] I have myself seen a fragment of a stone coffin in the island, which tradition has long asserted to have been the depository of the bones of the saint. A pilgrimage to the Isle of May was celebrated, in after-times, as a cure for barrenness in women.

II. Kelach I., about A.D. 890.

Of Sanct Andrewys the byshop than
Was Kellach, called an haly man,
When that kyng was this Gregore,
Whom of ye heard me speak before.[3]

He lived in the reigns of Gregory, Donald VI., and Constantine III.; under the last of whom he held a provincial council, in the year 906, on a little hill near Scone, called *collis credulitatis*, or the hill of faith.[4] At this council, the king and the bishop solemnly vowed

[1] This was St Monance, who has given his name to a parish in Fife, vulgarly pronounced St Minnins.

[2] See the Rev. Alban Butler's "Lives of the Saints." The Roman Church celebrates the festival of St Adrian on the 4th of March. The early Christians of uncommon sanctity were styled *saints* by a sort of general consent; but Pope Alexander III., in the twelfth century, reserved the exclusive right of canonization to the popedom.

[3] Wyntoun, vol. i. p. 175.

[4] In Gaelic, knock-reidigh. "I take it" (says Sir D. Dalrymple) "to have been a joint assembly of the laity and clergy, wherein a

"to observe the laws and discipline of the faith, and the rights of the churches and of the Gospel."

Concerning this Constantine III., Chalmers, in his "Caledonia," says—"There was a religious house at St Andrews, as well as an episcopal seat. Like other monasteries, that establishment formed originally the residence of the bishop. It was to this house that Constantine III. retired, when, fatigued with the infirmities of age, and the savageness of the times, he resigned his sceptre to Malcolm I., during the year 943,[1] and assumed the staff. Here the aged king acted as abbot of the Culdees; and, at the end of five years, finished his joyless career in this dreary pile." The "dreary pile" here referred to, was the Culdean monastery of Kirkheugh, mentioned in the last chapter as situated on the hill immediately above the harbour. Wyntoun thus records the same fact:—

Haddis son called Constantine
Kyng was threttty year; and syne,
Kyng he ceased for to be,
And in Sanct Andrewys a Culdee.
And there he lived yearis five,
And, abbot made, ended his lyve.

It was probably from the circumstance of Constantine's retiring to this monastery, that St Andrews got the Gaelic name of Kilremont—that is, the cell of the king upon the hill;[2] and that the common seal of the monastery had, on one side, a king crowned, holding a sword in his right, and a globe in his left hand, with the legend, "S. capituli ecclesiæ sanctæ Mariæ capellæ

national confession of faith was framed and promulgated, at a place near Scone, termed, from this event, Mons credulitatis."

[1] Buchanan's History of Scotland, book vi. p. 200. Pinkerton's Enquiry, vol. ii. p. 269.

[2] Here, again, the affinity between the Gaelic and Latin is observable; *kil*, cella; *re*, rex; *mont*, mons.

domini regis Scotorum." Fordun adds, that Constantine was buried at St Andrews, but that the monks of Iona, a few years after, came and dug up his body, removed it to their own monastery, and deposited it among the other ancient kings of Scotland.

III. Fothad I., about A.D. 930.

It is uncertain in what year Fothad I. became bishop; but king Indulfus banished him in the first year of his reign, which was 952. He is said to have lived in exile eight years; but the cause of his banishment is unknown. Wyntoun says that this bishop enclosed a copy of the Gospels in a silver case, which, at the time he wrote, (about A.D. 1390.) was lying at the north end of the high altar of the cathedral church. The following are his words, slightly modernized:—

Next this Malcolm was regnand[1]
Indulf nyne year in Scotland.
Fothad the byshop banished he
Out of Sanct Andrewys his awn see.
Yet this byshop, nevertheless,
Aucht year after that lyvand was.
He made a casket in that whyle,
Wherein was closed the Evangyle,
Plated o'er wyth silver brycht
On the hygh altar standand rycht
At the north end. There to rehearse
With Scottis hand graven is this verse:
"Hanc evangelii thecam construxit aviti
Fothad, qui Scotis primus episcopus est."
Intil Sanct Andrewys of Scotland
Kyrk Cathedrale yet standand,
This casket ilka man may see,
As before now heard have ye.

As there were many bishops in Scotland before Fothad, we must understand that the bishop of St

[1] Reigning. In the old Anglo-Scottish the present participle of the verb ends in *and*, though Wyntoun often makes it end in the comparatively modern *ing*, to suit his rhymes.

Andrews was the *chief* bishop of Scotland, from his being called *primus* episcopus.

According to the Register of the Priory, the Culdees of Lochleven made over their monastery to the care of this bishop, on the condition of being maintained and protected by him. Ronach, "a man of admirable sanctity," was their abbot at the time. Fothad is called "the son of Bren," and said to be famed for his unblemished life. He gave his full benediction to all who should observe the treaty entered into between him and the Culdees, and his malediction to all who should infringe it.[1] It seems a fair inference from this fact, that these Culdees submitted to Rome simultaneously with the bishops of St Andrews, which I conceive to have been in the reign of David I.

During this episcopate, parishes began to be formed in Scotland, and tithes to be paid to the clergy. It is certain, at any rate, that this payment was general all over the country, many years before the authority of Rome extended to it. "The right of the parish minister to the tithes," says Connell in his work on that subject, "seems to have been established in Scotland earlier than in England, or perhaps in any other country of Europe. That fourfold division (for the bishop, the parochial minister, the fabric, and the poor) which existed at one time on the Continent, does not seem to have been known among us."[2] The practice was, for the landed proprietor to convert his whole estate, or, if large, a part of it, into a parish, build a church, endow it with a tenth of the produce of the soil, and nominate a priest to do the duty, under the sanction of the bishop of the diocese. Such was the origin of tithes, parishes, and patronage.

[1] Register, p. 113. Appendix VI.

[2] Vol. i. p. 46.

IV. Malisius I., or Maelbright, A.D. 962–970.

This bishop was a disciple of the Irish saint Duthac, who is said to have *prophesied* that his pupil would one day rise to the highest ecclesiastical dignity in Scotland. He lived in the time of Kenneth III., who held an ecclesiastical convocation at Forfar, when it was enacted, "that priests should be exempted from paying tribute, keeping watch, or going to war; that all matters concerning them, such as tithes, marriages, testaments, and civil actions, should be committed to their bishops, with power to them to make canons, to try heretics, blasphemers, and magicians; and that all future kings should, at their coronation, take an oath for maintaining the church in her liberties."

V. Kellach II., son of Ferdlag, A.D. 971–996.

This is said to have been the first Scottish bishop who went to Rome for confirmation; but the fact rests only on the authority of Fordun. Wyntoun, who would hardly have omitted it, if true, says nothing on the subject. It is certain, at any rate, that this bishop's successors, for many years afterwards, did not think it necessary to follow his example. Our chronicler thus slightly touches on the present and previous bishops of St Andrews, and also on the two next but one, which one he unaccountably transfers to a future place.

> Malys in Scotland, a wyse man,
> Was of Sanct Andrewys byshop than
> Aucht wintere. And when he
> Was dead, then Kellach took that see,
> And held it twenty year and fyve.
> He secund Kellach in his lyfe
> Was titled. And when dead was he,
> The secund Malys tuk that see.
> Til hym succeedit Syre Malore,
> Of them 'tis gude to make memore.

VI. Fothad II., a.d. 996–1001.

During this episcopate, there was a furious civil war going on between Grime king of Scotland, and Malcolm, afterwards the second of that name. Bishop Fothad, who was held in universal esteem, grieved to see his country thus torn to pieces, went at the head of a procession of his monks, clad in their ecclesiastical robes, to Grime, and told him that he was come in the name of Christ who was the Minister of Peace, to entreat him to have pity on their distracted nation, and to put an end to the bloodshed, plunder, and misery which everywhere prevailed; offering to mediate a peace between the contending parties on terms which might be acceptable to both. Grime answered, that he had no objection to be at peace with Malcolm, provided he would concede to him his reasonable demands. The bishop next repaired to Malcolm, then at Stirling, whom he found equally disposed for peace. The result was, that commissioners were appointed on both sides, who met at Scone, and agreed to the terms of a treaty which produced a peace of eight years' continuance.[1] On the death of Grime, Malcolm succeeded to the throne. In gratitude to God, for enabling him to overcome his enemies the Danes, at Mortlich in Buchan, he erected all the surrounding district into a bishopric, which, though at first named after the place where he gained his victory, became afterwards better known as the diocese of Aberdeen. This made the fourth fixed diocese in Scotland. The same prince also conferred upon the bishopric of St Andrews the district of Monymusk, in Aberdeenshire, in fulfilment

[1] Buchanan, lib. vi. p. 219. Boethius, lib. xi. p. 230.—The latter calls Fothad, Maximus Episcopus Scotorum, adding that he was "vir summa virtute preditus et clementia."

of a vow that he would do so, if he succeeded in defeating a party of his own subjects who had rebelled against him. At that place there had long been a Culdean monastery, which thus became, and continued ever afterwards, a dependency on this see.

VII. Malisius II., A.D. 1001–1010.
VIII. Malmore, A.D. 1010–1031.
IX. Alivin, A.D. 1031–1034.

The only fact I find recorded under this episcopate is, that in the year 1033, "Hugh Macflavertai, king of Ailech, and heir of Ireland, after performing penitence, died in the church of St Andrews."[1] He probably had imitated the example of Constantine III., and retired to the Culdean monastery.

X. Maldun or Maldouay, A.D. 1034–1061.

We have the following fact recorded of this bishop in the Register of the Priory, p. 116:—"Maldun bishop of St Andrews, gave the church of Markinche, with all the land belonging to it, truly and religiously, to God, St Servanus, and the Culdees of the island of Lochleven."

The practice of bestowing gifts on these Culdees seems to have prevailed about this time, since we find no less a personage than Macbeth, the murderer of his uncle Duncan and the usurper of his throne, giving them the lands of Kirkness, for which he solicits, in return, the benefit of their prayers; of which, no doubt,

[1] When I made the above extract, I omitted to note whence I procured it; but upon consulting Moore's History of Ireland, I find no mention of the names either of Ailech or Macflavertai. He was, perhaps, some petty Irish prince, whose pretensions were greater than his rank.

he had much need. The document in the Register, p. 114, by which he conveys the above lands, begins, thus:—"Macbeth son of Finlach, and Gruoch daughter of Bodhe,[1] King and Queen of the Scots, granted to the Omnipotent God, and the Culdees of the island of Lochleven, Kirkness, according to its boundaries, which boundaries are as follows ——." Wyntoun speaks very favourably of Macbeth, with the single exception of the murder, which was so common an occurrence in those barbarous times, that little importance was attached to it. This Gruoch had been his uncle's wife. He made a pilgrimage to Rome, and was a liberal benefactor to the church.[2]

XI. Tothaldus or Twadal, A.D. 1061–1066.

This bishop also conferred upon the same Culdees, the church of Sconyn (Scoonie,) "freely and fully for the benefit of their prayers."[3]

[1] Better known among us as Lady Macbeth!

[2] And dame Gruoch his uncle's wyf
Tuk, and led with her hys lyf,
And held her both hys wyf and queen,
As before then she had been
Til hys uncle queen, livand
When he was kyng with crown regnand.
For little in honour then had he
The degrees of affinity.

———

All this tyme was great plenty
Aboundand both on land and sea.
He was in justice richt lawful,
And til hys legis all awful.
When Leo the nynd was pope of Rome,
As pylgrim to the court he come;
And in hys almis he sew sylver
Til all puir folk that had myster.*
And all tyme used he to wyrk
Profitably for haly kyrk.—Vol. i. p. 226.

[3] Register, p. 116.

* Need.

XII. Fothad III., or Modath, A.D. 1066–1077.

This bishop, in imitation of the example of his two predecessors, gave the church of Kirkindorath (Auchterderran ?) to the same Culdees. The following is a copy from the Register, p. 117, of this somewhat singular, and not very intellegible grant:—"Modath, son of Malmykel, bishop of St Andrews, of pious memory, whose life and learning are celebrated over all Scotland, gave to God, and St Servanus, and the Culdean hermits of Lochleven, living there in the school of virtue, the church of Kirkindorath, with all its liberties. These are the rents, (prestationes et canones,) which the said church was of old wont to yield—viz., xxx baked loaves, of the old measure of flour; xxx cheeses, one of which makes a chudreme; viii male (or 60 stone) of malt, derchede male, and cheder male."

During this episcopate, there was a great influx of English into Scotland, in consequence of the invasion of England by William the Conqueror. Among others, came Edgar Athling, and his sister the celebrated Margaret. According to Wyntoun, Bishop Fothad married the latter to Malcolm III., in the year 1067, only he calls him the *second* of that name.

> Of Sanct Andrewys the byshop than [1]
> The secund Fothad, a cunnand man,
> Devotly made that sacrament
> That they than took in gude intent.

As we have already had two Fothads, whom historical circumstances require to be where I have placed them, I cannot make Wyntoun's account to harmonize with history, except by considering his *second* to be in

[1] The words *than* and *then* are originally the same, being the imperative mood of the Anglo-Saxon verb THEAN, to assume, and are used indiscriminately by old writers.

fact a *third* bishop of that name. He singularly enough omits all mention of the Fothad who negotiated the peace between Grime and Malcolm.

In the year 1074, a council, or rather a conference, was held at St Andrews for the correction of ecclesiastical abuses. "A difficulty," says Chalmers, "soon occurred when the council met. The Scottish clergy could only speak Gaelic; Queen Margaret, who was present, and the *principal speaker*, could only speak Saxon; and the king, who understood both languages, acted as interpreter between them."

Malcolm added Moray and Caithness to the fixed dioceses of Scotland, thus augmenting their number to six.

XIII. Gregorius Cathre, a.d. 1077–1080. Elect.

Bishop Gregory presided over a convention of the clergy at Perth, where various canons were made for the better government of the church. At this time, according to Boethius, there was one Veremundus, a Spaniard by birth, Archdeacon of St Andrews, who wrote a history of Scotland. It has not come down to us; but Boethius professes to have read it, and to be greatly indebted to it. Dempster, in his Historia Ecclesiastica, says that this Veremundus was "rhetor, theologus, historicus," and a good Greek scholar, which was rare in those times; and that his book was entitled "Scotorum Antiquitates," in which he traced the history of the Scottish nation from Scota, daughter of Pharoah king of Egypt, down to the time of Malcolm III.

XIV. Edmarus, a.d. 1080–1091. Elect.
XV. Godricus, a.d. 1091–1107. Elect.

We are informed by Dempster that this bishop had been a merchant in his early days; but afterwards,

giving himself wholly up to divine things, he visited Palestine and other holy places. At length he returned to his native country, Scotland, when he was sixty years old, where, from the reputation of his uncommon sanctity, he was made Bishop of St Andrews. He crowned King Edgar, son of Malcolm III., after the defeat and death of Donald Bane. This king is said, by Boethius and Lesley, to have been the first who was anointed when crowned, and that Queen Margaret had procured this favour from the pope for her successors; a fact not easily reconciled with Wyntoun's assertion, that David II. was the first king of Scotland who was honoured with that ceremony. It may be added, that Edgar founded and endowed the abbey of Coldingham, and filled it with monks of the order of St Benedict; which is the first instance on record of Roman Catholic monks being settled in Scotland.

Sir James Balfour, in his "Annals of Scotland," tells us that, "in the year 1093, Edeldred earl of Fife, second son of Malcolm III., died, and was buried in the old church of St Andrews, because he had been a great benefactor to that monastery:" that is, I presume, as he had been a benefactor to the Culdees, he was buried in the old church of St Rule, which seems to have been, at that time, the place of worship attached to their Culdean monastery. This Edeldred had been Abbot of Dunkeld.[1]

XVI. Turgot, A.D. 1107–1115.

Turgot was prior of the monastery of Durham at the time of his being promoted to the bishopric of St Andrews. Bishop Eadmere, who succeeded him, tells us, in his history of his own time, that he was chosen

[1] Register of the Priory, p. 115. Appendix VI.

"with the concurrence of the king, the clergy, and the people;" for the custom which had existed from a very early age, of the people concurring in the election of their bishops, had not yet fallen into desuetude. The chartulary of Durham states that Turgot was raised to the *primacy* of Scotland, "ad episcopatum Sancti Andree in Scotia in qua est sedes *primatis* totius gentis Scotorum," which is another of the many proofs of the superiority of St Andrews to the other Scottish sees, even at this early period. Turgot was consecrated by Thomas archbishop of York, but without any profession of obedience to him, "sine ulla subjectionis exactione." The archbishop claimed this right of consecration on the ground that his province had, under the Northumbrian kings, comprehended the whole of the south of Scotland; and also on the plea of an old papal grant, but to which neither the king nor people of Scotland had been a party.[1]

Wyntoun thus alludes to the fact of Turgot's being Bishop of St Andrews:—

> Of Sanct Andrewys byshop than
> Turgot was, a cunnand man;
> Of Durhame before he was priore
> And Sanct Margaritis confessore.

This bishop, in concurrence with the king, founded and endowed the parish church of St Andrews, which one of his successors, Bishop Bernham, dedicated to the Holy Trinity.[2] It was endowed, like all the other churches of the period, with the great tithes of the parish; but these, about sixty years after, were granted by Bishop Richard to the priory;[3] and thus

[1] It must be mentioned to the credit of the later popes that they generally took the part of the Church of Scotland against the pretensions of her richer and more powerful neighbours the English.

[2] Register, p. 343. [3] Ibidem, p. 132.

the parish was converted into a vicarage, which it ever afterwards remained.[1] The church was subsequently furnished with no less than thirty altarages, each of which had at least one chaplain attached to it, whose business it was to celebrate *obits* for the souls of the founders and their connexions. The original charters founding and endowing the said altarages are still preserved. Among the chaplains of these altars we find mention made of—

Dominus	A. Menzies,	chaplain of the altar	of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
Dom.	Walter Mar,	do.	of St Katherine.
Dom.	Alex. Swinton,	do.	of Holy Cross.
Dom.	James Brand,	do.	of St Lawrence.
Dom.	John Peables,	do.	of St John Baptist.
Dom.	David Ruglying,	do.	of St Bartholomew.
Dom.	Thos. Simpson,	do.	of St James.

There were also the chapels and altars of All Saints, of St Phullan the abbot, of St Duchatt, St Mary Magdalene, St Barbara the Martyr, the Blessed Mary of Piety, St Michael the Archangel, St Ferguson, St Ninian, Holy Blood, St Nicholas, St Ann, and St Peter.

The charters endowing these altars were very numerous. Indeed, there was scarcely a house or tenement in St Andrews which did not yield a few shillings yearly to the chaplain of one or other of the altars. Yet it is remarkable that none of the charters are older than the beginning of the fifteenth

[1] There is a very ancient coat of arms, cut in wood, preserved in the town-hall of St Andrews. The arms are those of the city,—a boar tied to a tree, with St Andrew extended upon his cross. It was fixed in the old church before it was taken down, about fifty years ago, to make way for the present new one. It has upon it the date 1115, but it may be questioned whether it be so old. The chase and capture of the wild boar, (see the next episcopate,) which probably gave rise to the city arms, did not occur till some years subsequent to the above date.

century; which is a proof that it was only from that time that the abuse of hiring a chaplain to say masses for the dead began to prevail. The practice ceased, of course, at the Reformation; and the money was transferred by Queen Mary to the civil authorities of the town. This was, undoubtedly, an act of sacrilege; for though sacrificial masses for the dead was an error, yet the guardians of the money so bequeathed were under an obligation to apply it to a sacred purpose. This, and other sacrilegious acts on the part of Mary, of a still more decided and extensive character, have been justly considered as the cause of all the calamities which subsequently befell her. Such concessions must have been inconsistent with her principles, and were, perhaps, forced upon her, in a great measure, by her Protestant subjects, against her own convictions. At the same time, since she had the resolution to withstand their entreaties to change her religion, she might equally have had the firmness to deny their claim to apply the revenues of the church to their own private purposes.[1]

Attached to the same church were also fifteen choristers, who appear to have been an incorporated body, and had a seal of their own, of which I have an impression. The device upon it is, a skull and cross-bones, in reference, I presume, to the deceased persons whose *obits* were celebrated: and the legend "S. cōme. choristarū. eclie. Trinitatis sci. Andree."[2] Their endowments shared the same fate at the Reformation with those of the altarages.

"In the discharge of his episcopal duties, Turgot

[1] I may here mention it as an opinion, which I shall have occasion to support in the following work, that sacrilege, and the public violation of a solemn oath, are crimes which bring down the vengeance of Heaven upon the perpetrators in the present life. See Appendix LV.

[2] Common seal of the choristers of Trinity church, St Andrews.

met with many obstacles from Alexander I., surnamed 'the Fierce,' who, though he favoured the Church, was jealous of any authority which interfered with his own. And, perceiving that he had lost the influence which he had possessed while ecclesiastical affairs were directed by Queen Margaret, (to whom he was confessor,) the spirit of the old man sank within him; and, in a desponding mood, he asked and obtained permission to revisit his cell at Durham, where he died. Besides several other works in history and theology, Turgot wrote a life of his patroness, Margaret, which contains a faithful picture of that excellent woman, whose real merit far exceeds the fame of those idle miracles which have been attributed to her in later times; for she was truly religious, virtuous, and charitable."[1]

According to Dempster, (who is suspected of increasing the number of Scottish authors as well as the number of their works,) Turgot wrote, besides a life of Margaret, a life of her husband, Annals of his own times, and Chronicles of Durham. He also prevailed on the king to commence the cathedral of Durham; and to found a Culdean monastery at Dunfermline, whose church might be a burying-place for himself and his successors. This last was afterwards given by David I. to the monks of St Benedict.

XVII. Eadmere, A.D. 1120–1122. Elect.

Eadmere is himself an author, and has left us a history of his own time, in which he has amply detailed the circumstances connected with his promotion to, and resignation of the see of St Andrews. Soon after the death of Turgot, Alexander I. sent

[1] Sir Robert Sibbald's History of Fife, p. 245.

three envoys to Rodolph archbishop of Canterbury, with a letter to him, acquainting him with the vacancy in his principal see, and requesting him to recommend a fit person to fill it, "ut pontificali enthronizetur dignitate." The following is a copy of the king's letter to the archbishop[1]:—"To our dear lord and father, the Venerable Archbishop of Canterbury, Alexander, by divine mercy King of Scots, salutem et devotæ fidelitatis obsequium. We announce to you, most benign father, that the Bishop of St Andrews, dominus Turgodus, has departed this life the 2d kal. Septem., which is to us a source of grief. We therefore solicit from your paternal regard that assistance whereby we may be able to obtain a bishop who may know how to rule, and instruct us and our nation in the ways of God. And we entreat you also to remember what we formerly advertised you of, that the bishops of St Andrews were never wont to be consecrated by any but the Roman Pontiff, and the archbishop of Canterbury.[2] And this we upheld at all times, till your predecessor Langfranc, I know not by what authority, relaxed this privilege in favour of the Archbishop of York; but which, with your sanction, we will not concede to him. We therefore now hope and humbly beg, that you will aid us in the upholding of our church, and send us one who will prove himself worthy of the pontifical robe. Farewell." The envoys conveying the above letter, after having been favourably received by the archbishop, took a voyage to Nor-

[1] Eadmere's History, lib. v.

[2] We know of no previous instance in which a bishop of St Andrews was consecrated either by a pope or an archbishop of Canterbury, except one, and that is doubtful, p. 45. The assertion certainly does not harmonize with the fact, that Alexander afterwards refused to allow the archbishop to consecrate Eadmere himself. May not the latter have made use of a *pious fraud* in the composition of this epistle, with a view to honour his own mother church?

mandy, where the King of England then was, to solicit his concurrence to the measure. This the king willingly granted; after which they returned to Canterbury, and obtained an answer from the English primate, in which he offered to Alexander, Eadmere, one of his own monks, as a a person fully qualified to perform the duties of the vacant bishopric. Alexander, notwithstanding, delayed his acceptance of this offer for four years; "during which," says Eadmere, "he was not very solicitous to prevent the dilapidation of the episcopal revenues." At length he despatched a special messenger, Peter, the Culdean Abbot of Dunfermline, to Canterbury, with a second letter to the archbishop, in which he severely censured himself for having so long permitted the flock of Christ to wander without a shepherd, and requesting that Eadmere might be sent to him without farther delay. Rodolph accordingly sent Eadmere with a letter to the king, in which, after saluting him as "his dear lord and intimate friend," he says:—"We give unto God everlasting thanks that it hath pleased Him to open the eyes of your mind, and made you know and seek that which you ought to do. And to your highness we esteem ourselves greatly bound, because of your friendly and familiar usage; for, though your desires tend to our hurt, and are not less grievous to us than if you should pull out our eyes, or cut off our right hand, we cannot but commend your desire, and, so far as we may in God, obey the same. Therefore, unwilling and yet willing, we yield to your wish: willing, in so far as we perceive it is God's will, which we dare not withstand; and yet unwilling, for that we are left alone and deprived of his fellowship, who, as a father, ministered unto us consolation in time of grief; giving us sound advice in many perplexed cases, and has been to us a most helpful brother in this our infirm and old age. If any other

should have required him of us, we would no more have parted with him than with our own heart; but there is nothing which, in God, we can deny you. Thus we send unto you the person whom you desired; and so free, that you may lay on him what charge you will, so as it be to the honour of God, and the credit of the mother church of Canterbury. Do, therefore, what you purpose wisely, and remit him unto us with diligence to be consecrated, because delay in that affair may produce impediments which we desire to avoid." Eadmere was favourably received in Scotland, and, "with consent of the king, clergy, and people," made Bishop of St Andrews. But he never received consecration; for Alexander would not suffer either of the English archbishops to perform that ceremony, lest their doing so should be construed into a pretence for infringing on the independence of the Scottish Church. This was far from being agreeable to Eadmere, who was anxious "for the credit of the mother church of Canterbury;" which, he asserts, was "the primacy of all England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the adjacent isles," resting this on the authority which Pope Gregory had given to St Austin upwards of five hundred years before. But, as he could not make the king or clergy of Scotland converts to this opinion, he consented, after some hesitation, to receive the *ring* from the hands of Alexander, in token of his subjection to him *in temporalibus;* and of his own accord he took the *crosier* from off the high altar of the church, to show his independence *in spiritualibus*. Matters being thus compromised between them, it was hoped that everything would proceed smoothly. But Thurstan archbishop of York, hearing of what was going on, put in a claim to consecrate Eadmere, and prevailed on the King of England to write both to the King of Scotland and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to have

this measure carried into effect. And, what was then of still greater importance, he gained over Pope Calixtus II. to his interest, who not only commissioned him and his successors to consecrate the bishops of St Andrews, but all the bishops of Scotland, in all time coming. But it may be observed here, that this was before the authority of the Bishop of Rome was fully recognised in Scotland; and, besides, this order was reversed by subsequent popes, whose authority *was* recognised. Alexander, in the meantime, being equally unwilling to disoblige the pope and the King of England, and to acknowledge the supremacy of the English archbishops, began to grow cold in his behaviour towards the bishop elect. The latter, finding himself thus uncomfortably situated, informed the king that he wished to take a journey to Canterbury, for the purpose of consulting the archbishop relative to his very peculiar situation. The king told him that he never would consent that any of his bishops should yield obedience to Canterbury. To this Eadmere replied, with some warmth, that he would not renounce his connexion with Canterbury though he were to gain the whole kingdom of Scotland. The effect of this imprudent speech was only to increase Alexander's irritation, and to render the bishop's situation more unpleasant than it was before; whereupon he consulted the Bishop of Glasgow, and two monks of Canterbury who belonged to his household, how he ought to conduct himself under the circumstances of the case. These three went to court in his name, and, after discovering Alexander's resolution, told Eadmere that they thought he could no longer be of any service to the cause of religion in Scotland; that the king was of an arbitrary temper, and had, besides, a personal aversion to him; and that, therefore, he had better resign his office, and return to Canterbury. The bishop

took their advice, and gave in his resignation, which was accepted. He returned into the king's hands the ring which he had received from him, and laid the crosier upon the altar whence he had taken it. On his return to Canterbury, he was kindly received by the archbishop and his brother monks; but they disapproved of his stiffness, and thought him too hasty in giving up the honourable and useful office to which the providence of God had called him. Nor was it long before he himself became sensible of this. He, therefore, wrote a long letter to the king, in which he begins by returning him thanks for the honour of having fixed upon him for the bishopric of St Andrews, when there were so many men more worthy of it. He then says, that he did not address him out of any principle of ambition, but because all those whom he had consulted told him that it was not in his power to resign the bishopric, nor could any other person lawfully accept of it while he lived. "But, Sir," he goes on to say, "it may be your highness will object, that I threw it up of my own accord. To this I answer, that what I did was extorted from me by hard usage: I perceived the duties of my office to be impracticable, and, accordingly, thought proper to give way. But, if your highness would be pleased to remove these obstructions, and permit me the privilege of my character, I am ready again to undertake the charge, and observe your commands in everything not repugnant to the laws of God. But, if your highness is pleased to refuse me on these terms, I must desist: God, I question not, will take care of the interests of His church, and reward every person according to the quality of his behaviour. At the same time, that your highness may not suppose I have any intention to lessen the dignity and prerogative of the crown of Scotland, I promise not to trouble you again with the conditions

formerly mentioned relating to the King of England and the Archbishop of Canterbury, but submit to your own terms as to that affair." What effect this letter had upon the king is not known, for Eadmere's history breaks off here; from which it may be inferred that he died soon after. It is, certain, however, that he never returned to St Andrews.[1] Wyntoun, singularly enough, makes no mention of this bishop.

XVIII. Robert, A.D. 1121–1159.

Robert had been prior of the Augustinian monastery at Scone, before Alexander I. elevated him to the bishopric of St Andrews. In his youth he had been educated in the Anglo-Roman Church; and, as might be expected, used his endeavours, in concurrence with his contemporary sovereign David I., to uphold and propagate the papal authority in Scotland. He was not consecrated till the death of Alexander I., two years after his election, because that prince was so jealous of the Archbishop of York, that he would not allow him to perform the ceremony; and Robert, when, at last, he was consecrated by this prelate, protested, as we shall see, that no claim should be founded thereupon for asserting a jurisdiction over his Church.

But, before his consecration, an important occurrence took place in St Andrews, which we must here advert to. This was the grant from Alexander I. to the church, of the famous district of land called *Cursus Apri*, or Boar's Chase, which, in point of extent, seems to have comprehended the modern parishes of St Andrews, St Leonards, Denino, Cameron, and Kembach. The following is Boethius' account of this transaction:—"He (Alexander) augmented the revenues of the

[1] Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 316.

holy church of St Andrews, among other lands, with that which is called *Cursus Apri*, from a boar of immense size, which, after making a terrible slaughter of men and cattle, and having been often, at great risk, pursued by the huntsmen, was, at last, set upon by an armed multitude, and killed when attempting to make its escape across this track of land. There yet remain at St Andrews (about A.D. 1520,) marks of its astonishing size; viz:—the tusks which were extracted from its cheeks. These are sixteen inches long and four broad, and are attached by small chains to the altar of the church—ad sellas Divi Andree."[1] The curious ceremony with which the king conveyed the above grant to the church, is thus described by Wyntoun:—

In that intent and wyth gude will,
Sanct Andrewys city he cam til.
There in his devotioun
He ordayned to be religioun;[2]
And stedfastly that to be done
Robert that priore was of Scone
Byshop of Sanct Andrewys see
He ordayned that tyme to be,
With consent of Davy young[3]
(His heir next for to be kyng,
His broder and erle of Huntingtown)
At Sanct Andrewys religioun
Fra thence to be, gave his gude will:
And this purpose to fulfil
The "Boaris chace" in regale
To the kyrk the kyng gave hale.
The quhilk the canons, with his intent,
Suld have had; but by consent

[1] Lib. xii. p. 263. The city arms, a boar tied to a tree, probably arose out of this occurrence. The motto is, "Regalis cursus apri," and the legend, "Sigill. commune civitatis Sancti Andree." There is a district in the parish called "Boar Hills," which, perhaps, was the usual haunt of the animal in question. I am far from being sure as to the accuracy of the translation of "ad sellas." "Sella" would signify a stall in the choir of the church. If we may venture to read "cella," it might denote that the tusks were hung up in the cloister of the priory.

[2] A religious house or monastery.

[3] Young David, afterwards David I.

Of the byshop mycht nocht be,
Gotten to that, in na kind gre.
For-thi, twa year they let ow'r pass
Or he confirmed or blessed was.

It appears from this, that Alexander meant the *Cursus Apri* for the endowment of the projected priory, while Robert, on the other hand, was anxious to secure it for his bishopric; and that his pertinacity in this respect, was one reason why his consecration was postponed. But we shall see afterwards, that when David became king, he insisted on the grant being withdrawn from the bishopric, and annexed to the priory. Wyntoun thus proceeds with his narrative:—

In wytness and in tokening
That in this purpose stood the kyng,
And in full conditioun
At Sanct Andrewys to be religioun,
Before the lordis all, the kyng
Gart them to the altar bryng
Hys comely steed of Araby,
Saddled and bridled costlyly,
Covered wyth a fayre mantlet
Of pretious and fyne velvet,
With his armory of Turkey
That Prince then used generally,
And chused maist for their delyte,
Wyth shield and spear of sylver whyte,[1]
Wyth many a pretious and fayre jewel,
That now I leave for cause to tell,
Wyth the regale and all the lave
That to the kyrk that time he gave,
Wyth usual and auld customis,
Rychts, rents, and freedomis,

[1] The shaft of the spear was afterwards converted into a cross, and, as such, was remaining in the time of Bower, the continuator of Fordun, who wrote about A.D. 1430, and no doubt remained till the Reformation. How much it is to be regretted that the plunderers of that era did not spare some of these and other relics, if it were only to enable us to judge of the taste and skill of our forefathers in works of art! They *might* have preserved, besides these valuable gifts of Alexander I., the still more antique silver casket of Bishop Fothad, which contained a copy of the Gospels; the boar's tusks, with their silver chains; and a few at least of the sacred utensils—all consecrated by their connexion with the high altar of the metropolitan cathedral;—but all have perished, or probably, worse, have been profaned!

In bill titled, and there read,
Wyth horse arrayed he gart be led.
Wyth the consent of Davy young
His broder, and trow'd for to be kyng,
He made this devout offerand,
Baith to God and man pleasand.
The byshop of Sanct Andrewys town
Maist by this conditioun
Halds the regale in sic freedome,
As yet the use is and custome.

The above ceremony must have taken place in the old church of St Rule, as the building of the cathedral had not yet commenced.

We now come to the consecration of Bishop Robert, which Wyntoun places in 1122, adding that, after this, he remained bishop thirty-four years, which would bring down his episcopate till 1156; and yet he subsequently extends it till 1159. This discrepancy I am unable to explain.

A thousand, a hundyr, and twenty year,
And twa theretil to reckon clear,
The Byshop Robert that before
Of Scone was umquhile priore,
Of the archbyshop of York had
Confirmation, and was mad
Byshop of Sanct Andrewys towne;
Under protestatioune
That na kyn scath na prejudice
Suld to the Kyrk of Scotland rise;
Til ilka kyrk the rycht suld stand
Of Ingland evenlyke and Scotland,
And in Rome of the papys see
Before all, saving the dygnity.
He stood as 'lect twa year oure,
And byshop thretty year and four.

The following is a copy of the deed of Robert's consecration:[1]—"Thurstan, by the grace of God Archbishop of York, to all the sons of holy mother church, *salutem*. Be it known to all men, that I, for the love of God, and of David king of Scotland, have

[1] Sir R. Sibbald's "Independence of the Scots Church," p. 16.

consecrated, without any profession of obedience, Robert bishop of St Andrews, waiving the claim of the church of York, and the right of the church of St Andrews. And if hereafter the archbishop of York shall prosecute his claim, the king shall, without ill will towards him, grant him full right so to do. Witnesses—Ronulphus bishop of Durham, John bishop of Glasgow, Golfred abbot of the Monastery of York, and nineteen others, besides the whole chapter of St Peters."

The next and most important event under this episcopate, is the commencement of the celebrated Priory of St Andrews. Robert, as I before remarked, had been prior of the canons-regular of the order of St Augustine at Scone. After being made bishop, King Alexander and David his heir, both determined to found a religious house in St Andrews of the same order. The bishop, too happy to concur in a measure which was in all respects so agreeable to his feelings, sent for some of his late brother monks to make a beginning of the new monastery, and made some considerable grants out of his episcopal revenues for their maintenance. The site of the new institution was at the east end of the city, and on the south side of the cathedral, to which it was attached. Not only did Robert and his successors make numerous grants to it, but they obtained for it, from the kings of Scotland and many of the nobility, a variety of endowments of churches, lands, tithes, tenements, mills, cattle, &c., as also, from the Roman pontiffs, bulls conferring very ample privileges on its inmates. I shall not here dwell upon these and other particulars relating to the priory, because I shall often have occasion to refer to the subject, and because in the Appendix[1] will be found an account of all that

[1] See Appendix VI.

is known concerning it; and hence I shall do no more now than state what is recorded in a MS. quoted by Sir R. Sibbald,[1] that "when some houses and the cloister of the priory, were so far finished as to admit, as residents, men of moderate and contented minds, who could wait with patience till better accommodations were provided, Robert requested Ethelwolf bishop of Carlisle, by letters and messengers, as well as through the personal solicitation of King David, to send him from the church of St Oswald, of which the bishop had been prior, a person fit to share in his labours, and to be appointed prior to the canons whom he was resolved to place in the church of St Andrews." Accordingly he received from thence a monk named Robert, whom he made the first prior of his monastery. It is added, that "Bishop Robert would not allow any of the Culdees to become inmates of his priory, because they were a secular clergy, and married men, and could not, therefore, be expected to conform heartily to the self-denying ordinances of the canons-regular."

Such was the commencement of the Priory of St Andrews, which, if we may believe Boethius, was second to none in France, Germany, England, or Italy, for the magnificence of its buildings, the amount of its revenues, and the learning, piety, and virtue of its inmates.[2] But Boethius, it is known, is apt to exaggerate; and I fear he has done so in this instance. Its revenues were undoubtedly very great, and we have no reason to question the piety or learning of its monks; but in respect to the magnificence of its buildings, we cannot perhaps speak so positively, since, in common with all the other monasteries of Scotland, very few vestiges of them remain. At the same time, if we may

[1] In his History of Fife, p. 189.

[2] Lib. VI., p. 106.

judge from the ruins of the cathedral church, which was attached to the priory, we must confess that, as to architectural beauty, they are equalled, if not surpassed, by those of Melrose, Elgin, Arbroath, and Kelso, not to mention the churches in England and foreign countries.

Wyntoun gives a long account of King David I. coming to St Andrews, with his son and many of his nobles, soon after the commencement of the priory. He was received by the bishop and his clergy in their canonical robes. After passing the night in the town, hearing mass next morning, and making certain offerings to the church, the king repaired to the cloister of the new priory, where he held a public conference with Bishop Robert. Anxious for the progress and endowment of the monastery, he reminded him that the late king had given the *Cursus Apri* for the support of that establishment exclusively; and though Robert gave his reasons why he thought it ought to remain with the bishopric, David overruled those reasons, and settled the gift on the prior and canons in perpetuity. We will allow our chronicler to tell the story in his own words:—

This kyng Davy had gret delyte
Kyrkis and abbays til visyte.
Of sic delyte and sic gude will
Of Sanct Andrewys the city til
He cam, and hys son the erle Henry,
And wyth them lordis richt mony.
Of Sanct Andrewys the byshop than,
Robert that was a vertuous man,
Ressaved the kyng richt honorably,
Revested well wyth his clergy.
There the kyng was all that nycht,
Til on the morn the day was lycht.
Than heard he mass, and made offering
Baith lyke to man and God pleasing.
And after all that this was done,
The kyng gaed to the cloister soon;
Sic a cloister as then was,
Not sic as now is for largess;

For neither was then made the dormitory,
Nor as it now is the refectory ;
Nor sic a kyrk as ye now see,
So large was made in quantity.
The kyng unto the cloister there
And lordis that then by him were
Conferred a while of sundry thyngis,
As oft is used in sic gatheryngis.
Syne, because why he came there
He tald them all that by hym were.
The byshop Robert, that gude man,
He convened before hym than,
And argued hym rycht sharply,
That he farthered ower slowly
His covenant and his awn debt,[1]
Whych was, he suld gar there be set,
And founded of devotioune,
In that stead a religioune,
And chanons to bring in regular,
To serve God and Sanct Andrew there.
Alexander, his broder kyng,
Of that, before his last ending,
Stablish'd and made ordynance,
He said, and full delivyrance.
Upon this, by sundry ways
Between them caused was controversys.
The byshop said, by rycht raison,
He mycht not til religioun
The rentis give of the byshopric.
Though his will were to do sic
Alms, perchance his successour
Wold them wythdraw wyth gret rigour,
And despoyle them halily,
And slaunder, as gyven wrongously.
The kyng then made him this answere,
In gentle and in fair mannere,
And said, that land they used all
The "boaris chace" all time to call,
Was gyven on that conditioun,
To found there a religioun.
The kyng and his son Henry,
And all the lordis near him by,
So then favoured that treaty,
That they gart the chanons be
(The whych were brought before fra Scone,
And in Sanct Andrewys kyrk were done)
Chartered of that land hale
That they have in their regale.
The kyng of his devotioun
Gave thereon confirmatioun,

[1] Obligation.

And his son, the erle Henry,
Consented theretil wilfully.

Bishop Robert, having settled the administration of the priory, and placed over it a competent cœnobiarch, next turned his attention to civil matters. Through his influence with the king, he procured the city of St Andrews, which was now growing into importance, to be erected into a royal burgh. Its first provost was one Maynard, a Fleming, (or Maynard Fleming, as he is sometimes called,) an opulent merchant. There was probably a considerable commerce carried on in this place, even at that remote period. The reputed sanctity of the spot, the progress of the religious buildings, the increasing number of the monks, and, above all, the multitude of pilgrims who resorted hither from all parts to adore the relics of the patron Apostle, must have greatly contributed to the increase of its trade. The merchants are said to have been chiefly foreigners. In a charter of Malcolm IV., who was contemporaneous with Bishop Robert, there is mention made of the "Scotch, French, Flemish, and English, who were then residing inside and outside of the city."[1] The articles of export were wool, skins, salted fish, horses, sheep, and oxen; those of import, were fine linen and silks, gold and silver, carpets and tapestry, wine, olive oil, drugs, arms, armour, and cutlery.

It was in the reign of David I., as I have before remarked, and during the episcopate of Robert, that the authority of the pope was fully acknowledged in Scotland. David founded various monasteries, and filled them with orders of monks which were in connexion with Rome; on account of the expense of which, he has been called "ane sair sanct for the crown."

He illumined in hys dayis
Hys lands with kyrkis and abbayis.

[1] Register of the Priory, p. 193. Appendix VI.

Byshoprics he fand but four or three,
But, or he died, nyne left he.
Abbays he founded nyne or ten,
And set in them religious men.

His object seems to have been, as much to civilize as Christianize his rude subjects; and, doubtless, these institutions could not fail to have this effect, from the generally pious example of the monks, the schools which were commonly attached to their monasteries, the missionaries they sent forth to evangelize the surrounding country, and the administration of the Christian sacraments to all who required them. David, also, was the first Scottish king who received a legate from the Court of Rome, viz., John of Crema, a cardinal priest, who was deputed by Honorius II., and held a council at Roxburgh in A.D. 1125. One object of this council was, to recommend the celibacy of the secular clergy, though the legate is accused by historians of not having set an example of this virtue in his own person.[1] But as this is the first instance that we know[2] of a papal legate being sent to Scotland, or of a papal bull being addressed to a Scottish king or prelate, it may be curious to see a copy of the document which was transmitted to David on the occasion in question:—"Honorius episcopus, servus servorum Dei, to our beloved son David king of Scots, *salutem, et apostolicam benedictionem.* It behoves all the sons of St Peter to labour diligently to uphold the honour of the holy Roman Church. We therefore entreat your highness to entertain honourably our beloved son John, cardinal, whom we have deputed to visit your country. You will assemble

[1] Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 319.

[2] I have searched in vain in the Bullaria Romana, and other sources, for a bull of an earlier date. I am far from asserting there were none; on the contrary, I think there must have been a few, but I have not succeeded in discovering them.

your bishops to the council to be held by him. The controversy which has long existed between the Archbishop of York and your bishops, he will investigate, but the final decision we reserve to ourselves. Dated at the Lateran, Id. April." There had been an occasional intercourse with Rome before this.—(See p. 31.) The Scots had also given up the ancient, and adopted the Roman method of computing Easter, as well as of shaping the tonsure, which they appear to have done more for the sake of uniformity than as a badge of their dependence; but now the papal authority was completely recognised and peaceably submitted to. Yet neither the Scottish king nor clergy were at any time slavish upholders of it. They avowed themselves, with the rest of Europe, members of the Roman Catholic Church, and, situated as they were, this was, perhaps, the wisest thing they could do; but they often, as we shall see, refused compliance with its demands, when they thought them unreasonable.

King David, besides his other exertions in favour of the church, added four bishoprics to the six previously established, namely, Ross, Brechin, Dunkeld, and Dunblane.

It would appear that Bishop Robert, a few years before his death, began to feel the effects of old age so much, that he applied to the reigning pope, Adrian IV., to be specially exempted from peforming the more laborious duties of his office. Adrian, in consequence, issued the following bull:—

"Adrianus episcopus, &c., to our venerable brother, Robert bishop of St Andrews, *salutem*, &c. Seeing it is our bounden duty to watch over all the faithful in Christ, we are more especially called on to consult the welfare of our brother bishops, and to listen attentively to their petitions. Moved by this consideration, we permit that, when it appears you are

oppressed by old age or infirmity, you shall not be obliged to go beyond the limits of your diocese (parochia) unless required to do so by the supreme pontiff, or by one appointed *ex ipsius latere*. Farther, since you will have to render an account to the Impartial Judge, of the people committed to your care, we require you, by this our authority, to restrain the wicked from their excesses, and to preserve the good from the contagion of evil; that thus, showing your impartiality in all things, you may neither fear the power of the great, nor despise the weakness of your inferiors. Given at Narñ, 3d Id. Aug." (A.D. 1154.)[1]

This bishop's gifts to the Priory of St Andrews are enumerated in the Register of that institution, p. 122–126. Its foundation charter is in p. 122.

The bishop's death is thus recorded by Wyntoun:—

> A thousand, a hundyre, fyfty and nyne
> Frae lychter was the sweet Virgyne,
> Robert of Sanct Andrewys than
> Byshop, the gude vertuous man,
> Hys spyrit yald to hys Creature,
> Hys body til hallowed sepulture.
> In the auld kyrk there he lyes,
> Hys spyrit intil paradys.

By the "auld kyrk" we are to understand the old church of St Regulus; but not a trace is discoverable either of his monument or those of any one of his predecessors or successors. Such were the disastrous consequences of an ultra-reformation!

In Anderson's Diplomata there is a copy of the seal of Bishop Robert,—the bishop clad in his canonicals, with this simple legend:—"Sigillum Roberti epi. Scotorum." Some of his predecessors had called themselves "primus," others, "maximus episcopus Scotorum." Bishop Fraser, in the year 1297, was

[1] The original is in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

the first who assumed the title of "Episcopus Sancti Andreæ," as did his successors till the see was erected into an archbishopric, when, of course, they became "archiepiscopi."

The first prior of the monastery, as already mentioned, was one Robert, an English Augustinian monk. We have no particulars concerning him, except that he exercised the duties of his office in an exemplary manner, from the year 1140 till his death in 1162. His name occurs frequently in the Register of the Priory, as having various grants made or confirmed to him and his canons, by Pope Innocent II., p. 42; by Bishop Robert, p. 43; by Lucius II., p. 47; by Eugenius III., p. 48; by Adrian IV., p. 51; and, lastly, by David I., p. 189.[1]

After Bishop Robert's death, the following bull was issued by Pope Alexander III., in reference to an application which Malcolm IV. had evidently made to him to fill up the vacant bishopric. The allusion in the first part is obscure, but the latter part will be found to throw light on what occurred at the consecration of the next bishop:—"Alexander episcopus, &c. to the venerable the archdeacon, prior, and clergy of the church of St Andrews, &c. The petition which [William] bishop of Moray, and Nicholas, presented unto us on the part of Malcolm, the illustrious King of Scotland, we would gladly have agreed to, could we have justly done so; but we, anxious to give satisfaction to the said king our son, both in the reformation of the church, and in the honour of his kingdom, have corrected his petitions, and changed them into a better form; for, as we have said, that which his messengers proposed to us, we could not justly fulfil, because, your church being

[1] See Appendix VI.

without a pastor, it would be unbecoming in us to grant the confirmation of such things as were demanded. But, by the advice of our brethren, and for the good of the church and of the king himself, we have seen fit to grant the legation of the whole kingdom of Scotland to our brother the Bishop of Moray, though unsolicited by him, in order that he may correct what needs correction, and supply what is wanting. So that if, with his advice, you can unanimously agree on some one for your bishop, and the king give his consent, he may be at once appointed. But, since translations of this kind ought not to be made without the concurrence of the Roman pontiff, we will require him to come to Rome; not, however, for his confirmation, but that he may, from that time, take upon himself the legation and the plenitude of the pontifical office in the Scottish Church; and we, after his appointment, will take care, with God's help, to confirm to him and his church all his ancient and accustomed privileges. But if you cannot agree upon a bishop, we at least require you to agree upon some one who is qualified, and elect him your pastor; and if you present him to us, we will deal with him fairly, and honour him as we may see fit. But, from the time that he is confirmed and consecrated, he shall obtain, by our authority, the legation of the whole kingdom of Scotland, and execute the duties of the same in those parts. Given at Avignon, 10 kal. Dec." [1159.][1]

[1] The original is in the Advocates' Library.

CHAPTER V.

Lives and Times of the Bishops of St Andrews, from the Succession of Bishop Arnold in A.D. 1159, *the Founder of the Cathedral, till the Death of Bishop Malvoisine in* 1238.

XIX. Arnold, A.D. 1159–1163.

"Bishop Robert being dead," says the historian Jocylin, a monk of Furness abbey, "the Episcopal see of St Andrews became vacant. Whereupon the petition of the people, the election of the chapter, and the consent of the nobles concurred in choosing Waldeve (afterwards St Waldeve) abbot of Melrose, to be the pastor and bishop of their souls. Accordingly, the clergy and nobility having met, repaired to Melrose for the purpose of claiming and removing their elect. Waldeve's superior, Aëlred, the abbot of Reivalle,[1] who happened to be in the abbey at the time, gave it as his opinion that he ought to comply with their call, and undertake the office to which he had been unanimously nominated. But Waldeve, after pleading his age, and incapacity for sustaining so heavy a responsibility, thus addressed those who had applied to him:—'I have thrown aside my tunic,[2] how can I put it on again? I have washed my feet, why should I again soil them with the dust of worldly cares? There, (pointing to the cemetery of his abbey,) there is my dwelling-place, and here will I abide so

[1] An abbey of Cistertians in Yorkshire, from which King David had furnished that of Melrose with monks.

[2] A garment worn by a secular priest.

long as it shall please God to continue me in life.'"[1] When it was found that his determination was unalterable, Arnold abbot of Kelso was chosen in his stead; who, accordingly, was consecrated in the old church of St Rule by William bishop of Moray, the pope's legate, in the presence of King Malcolm IV., and many of the bishops, abbots, and nobility of the land.[2] This William, as we have seen in the last episcopate, had been the same year at Rome, and came home invested with legantine power, which he now, by the command of the pope, transferred to Arnold as the superior bishop.

The late bishop having begun the priory for the accommodation of the canons, Arnold, with the concurrence and coöperation of the king, laid the foundation of the cathedral church for the celebration of their worship, and as a necessary appendage to his own see; but he had not proceeded far with the work before he died.

Arnold was chosyn to that see,
Ten moneth and a year was he
Byshop. Of Kelso upon Tweed
Abbot before he was indeed.
The great kyrk of Sanct Andrewys he
Foundyd that to be the see
Of all the hale byshopryck.
The kyng then of our kynryk,[3]
Malcolm, at that foundatioune
Was present in his awn persoune.

The construction of the cathedral proceeded, as we shall see, under no less than eleven successive prelates,

[1] Some curious particulars concerning this Waldeve, (or Waltheof, or Walterus, as the name is variously written,) and the miracles ascribed to him, are related in Morton's Monastic Annals of Teviotdale, p. 202-212; and in Butler's Lives of the Saints under 3d August. He was the son of Maud countess of Northumberland, who subsequently became the wife of David I., and thus Waldeve was the stepson of that king.

[2] Fordun, vol. i. p. 350.

[3] Kingdom.

and was not finished till one hundred and fifty-eight years after its commencement. We may observe here, that it was the constant practice, in all ecclesiastical structures of that period, to begin with the east end, and to finish the choir with as little delay as possible, for the performance of divine service. The architects then proceeded to the transepts and the nave; each succeeding bishop or prior adding a part to the sacred edifice, till the whole was completed. The work generally went forward at a slow rate, occasioned by an anxiety to have it executed in the most approved style, and by the want of funds to provide a sufficient number of regularly-bred artificers. It often happened that so many years elapsed before they reached the west end of the church, that the architectural taste or fashion had undergone some change, in which case they finished the building according to the new taste; and then, sometimes but not always, altered the eastern part to make it correspond. Of this we have an example in the cathedral here. There are still standing in the east gable and south transept, several Anglo-Norman or *round*-arched windows, while the later *pointed* ones (improperly termed Gothic) are in the nave towards the west. In the east gable are three very fine specimens of the former, and above them there *were* three others exactly similar, of which the traces may yet be perceived; but they were removed in the time of Bishop Wardlaw, (see his episcopate,) and the present large window substituted in their place, having an arch with a very obtuse spherical angle; and this formed the commencement of the pointed arch, which, from that time, became almost universal.

We may further observe, that in cathedral churches, the monastic buildings attached to them were usually on the south side of the edifice; and in St Andrews

they certainly were. Those buildings consisted of the quadrangular cloister, (the north side of which formed the south wall of the nave of the church and communicated with it by two door-ways,) the chapter-house, the refectory, the dormitory, the scriptorium, infirmary, sacristy, the prior's and sub-prior's houses, the hospitium or great hall for the entertainment of strangers, and the apartments of the numerous dependants attached to the monastery. These edifices were not all erected at once, nor even in the course of a few years, but, like the parts of the cathedral, were gradually added, as we shall see in the sequel, by successive bishops and priors, as their piety prompted, or as their pecuniary resources admitted.

It was either during this or the next episcopate that Malcolm IV. made a free grant to the citizens of St Andrews, the original of which is preserved among the charters of the city, beautifully written on a very small piece of parchment. The following is a translation of it:—"Malcolm king of Scotland wishes health to all good men. Know that I have granted, and by this deed confirmed, to the burgesses of the Bishop of St Andrews, all the liberties and privileges which my burgesses have in common over my whole dominions, and wherever they may repair. Wherefore my will is, and of my full power of forfeiture I strictly command, that no person exact from them any thing unjustly. Witnesses:—Walter, chancellor; Hugh de Moriville; Walter, son of Allan; Walter de Lindesea; Robert Avenel. At St Andrews."[1]

[1] It has been asserted that the above-mentioned grant is by Malcolm the *Second*. This is a mistake. These very ancient documents, it is well known, are without date; nor did the sovereign by whom they were executed think it necessary to distinguish himself from his predecessors or successors, except by his seal, and the names of his witnesses. With respect to the witnesses to the grant in question, we know that they were all contemporary with Malcolm IV., and in the

Malcolm, it is well known, never married, though it was the anxious desire of his subjects that he should do so. The following address to him on the subject Boethius ascribes to Bishop Arnold, in an assembly of the nobles:[1]—"There is one thing, O king, pertaining to the common weal, which it concerns me to speak of, and to which I pray you will give the more heed, as it relates as much to your own as to the public welfare. After you had disposed of your two sisters in marriage, we could understand why you had resolved on leading a single life. But, seeing you still persist in this, though, doubtless, from the purest motives,—if you will listen to me whose counsel was never offered to you in vain; and if I shall show you that nothing can be more honourable, or more praiseworthy, or more useful, nay, more necessary to your kingdom and yourself, than matrimony,—you will give up your determination, and yield to our wishes. For what can be more honourable than that which is enjoined, not only by the Lacedemonian Lycurgus, and the Cretan Minos, and the Athenian Solon, (who, though they were great legislators, from whose writings the Roman laws were afterwards derived, yet, being men, might err, and did err,) but is commanded by God himself, the Author of our existence: and, if He had known anything better

practice of attesting similar documents, of which there are many examples extant. Hugh de Moriville was high-constable under David I. and Malcolm IV., and founded the abbeys of Dryburgh and Kilwinning. Walter, son of Allan, was the ancestor of the royal family of the Stewarts, and founder of the abbey of Paisley. Robert Avenel was the first of the family of that name in Scotland. He was a liberal benefactor to Melrose abbey, in which he became a monk, and died in 1185.[a] The above distinguished personages, together with Walter de Lindesea (or Lindsay) and his brother William, came from England with David I., who settled considerable grants of land upon each of them. A fac-simile of Malcolm's charter has recently been executed, and published in the Statistical Account of the Parish of St Andrews.

[1] Lib. xiii. p. 269.

for man, he would doubtless have required it. Again, what can be more praiseworthy among men than that whereby human existence is accomplished? Or, if that is most to be commended which is most agreeable to human nature, what is more to be commended than the union of the sexes? You will say, perhaps, that the celibacy of the saints, and even of Christ himself, is above all things to be praised. But what then? All men are not saints; nor have they all this gift granted to them. They, indeed, who are in this situation, should live singly. I not only do not oppose it, but I commend it. But this is not your lot or vocation. Your duty is rightly to govern that kingdom which you have received from God. And to this end, what is better than to set a good example to the people in such things as they can imitate you? And not only to command, by laws and edicts, but exhibit every virtue in your life and conversation? Nay, what can be conceived more useful or agreeable than to have a wife, to whom you can impart your griefs and troubles when they arise, and who, in her turn, can console you by her sympathy and kindness? Who can better charm you when well? who better appease you when angry, or refresh you when weary?—who will more anxiously provide both for your mind and body? Nor need you fear that you cannot find any one suitable for you: that might be a source of apprehension to some, but it cannot be to you, from whom nothing is concealed. Lastly, what is more necessary to a king than a family? Who can be of greater use, in peace and war, than sons? In peace, that the kingdom may be wisely governed, seeing trustworthy men are few; and, in war, what leaders would you sooner put at the head of your armies? Whom would your subjects more esteem, or your enemies more fear, than those whom they know to be heirs of the crown? It was

said of old by wise philosophers, that men are not born for themselves only, (those especially who are appointed by God to govern his people,) but for their friends, their children, their parents, and, above all, their country. If, therefore, I have proved it to be honourable, praiseworthy, useful, and necessary, in everything, but more particularly in having offspring, to contribute to the prosperity of the commonwealth, be persuaded that you are opposing the will of God, when, by your own act, you are depriving your kingdom of the prospect of a successor to your throne."

This speech did not produce the desired effect. Malcolm persevered in his resolution not to marry, and died at the early age of twenty-four; on which account he is sometimes called by historians "the maiden king."

Bishop Arnold's gifts to the priory are enumerated in p. 126–130 of its Register; among which are the churches of Dairsey and Portmoak; in other words, the great tithes of these parishes. The canons were bound to supply them with vicars, who were answerable to them *de temporalibus*, but to the bishop of the diocese *de spiritualibus*. Wyntoun thus mentions Arnold's death and burial:—

> A thousand, hundyre, sixty and three
> After the blest Nativitye,
> The gude byshop Syre Arnold
> To hys Maker hys spyrit yhald,
> Hys body to hallowed sepulture
> In the auld kyrk there with honour.

In Anderson's Diplomata, there is an engraving of this bishop's seal—the bishop in his pontifical robe, holding a crosier, with this legend, "Sigil. Arnoldi dei gra. Scotorum epi."

XX. Richard, A.D. 1163–1178.

And after that he so was dead,
Rychard, byshop in hys stead,
Chosen he was *concorditer*,
And elect twa years bade after.
But syne the byshopis of Scotland,
Power full to that havand
Of the popis commissioun,
Gave hym ministratioun,
Confirmatioun, and blessing hale,
By the popis letters special.

Wyntoun here mentions Richard's remaining two years elect; but does not state the cause of it. It appears that Roger archbishop of York, some years before this, had procured from Pope Anastasius IV., a bull constituting him metropolitan of Scotland; and, on the strength of this, he now claimed the right to perform the ceremony of consecrating Richard. When he found the Scottish king and bishops extremely averse to this measure, he summoned some of the latter, in his capacity of papal legate, to meet him at Norham, and there laboured hard to bring them over to his views, but without effect. The dispute was then referred to the reigning pope, Alexander III., who, after hearing deputies from both parties, decided in favour of the independence of the Scottish Church, exempting it from all foreign jurisdiction, except that of Rome itself. Richard was, accordingly, consecrated at St Andrews by the bishops of his own church, in the year 1165,[1] they having, as we have just seen, received authority for that purpose from the supreme pontiff. In the same year died Malcolm IV.; and within fifteen days after, his brother William, Earl of Northumberland,

[1] Chronicle of Melrose, as quoted by Sir James Dalrymple in his "Collections."

was solemnly crowned at Scone by Bishop Richard, in presence of the three estates of the realm.

When King William was taken prisoner by the English at Alnwick, in 1173, this bishop, together with several of the Scottish nobility and dignified clergy, were deputed to Henry II., at that time in Normandy, to treat concerning his ransom. This object they effected, but not without difficulty:

> The byshop of Sanct Andrewys than
> Rychard that called was a wyse man,
> And other lordis with hym moe,
> Byshopis and baronis gret also,
> O'er sea past in Normandy,
> For to treat there with Henry
> Kyng of England, to find and see
> How they micht by fayre treaty
> Delyverit get the kyng Williame,
> And intil Scotland bryng hym hame.
> Upon this they treated fast;
> So they accordit at the last,
> That in all truce and on peace
> And covenant that accordyt was,
> All and ilkane firmly
> To be halden, and sykerly
> To be keepit, was there accord
> For the delyverance of our lord.
> The three castellis of Roxburgh
> Of Berwick and Edinburgh
> And other hostages fyfteen,
> The grettest that in our land was seen,
> Suld be delyverit fully
> To the kyng of England, Henry.

The English, having thus obtained terms very favourable for themselves, in regard to the *state* of Scotland, next tried to secure terms equally favourable in respect to its *church*, and again to urge subjection to the Archbishop of York as its metropolitan: and in this they were supported by Cardinal Hugo, who was at that time the papal legate in England. In order to settle this matter, a convention was held at Northampton, at which were present the chief dignitaries of the English Church, including the two archbishops; and, on the

other side, the Bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld, assisted by a few of their brethren. The cardinal endeavoured to impress upon our bishops, that in all other Christian countries, their order had a metropolitan, under whom they were united, and to whom they referred their minor complaints, thereby saving themselves the time and expense of appealing to Rome; while in Scotland, there being nothing of the kind, great inconvenience arose to the Church in that kingdom. "York," he added, "is not only near to Scotland, but it is a city of great wealth and resources. Besides, it is but reasonable that the lesser church should be subject to the greater; and no virtue is more to be commended in churchmen than humility, and obedience to the commands of their ecclesiastical superiors." This address, combined with similar insidious attempts on the part of the English prelates, called forth the energy and eloquence of one of the Scottish deputies, a young canon of Moray, of the name of Gilbert:—"Truly, O English!" he exclaimed, "you are a noble race, more so than most other nations; but the power of your nobility, and the strength of your fortitude, ought not to be converted into the audacity of tyranny; nor your liberal knowledge into the cunning of sophistry. You do not, in this instance, act fairly and honestly; but, on the contrary, elated by the number of your troops, and the abundance of your riches, you seek, through the lust of conquest, to reduce to subjection a neighbouring nation, who cannot, indeed, equal you in power and numbers, but who are, nevertheless, more illustrious in rank, and more venerable by their antiquity than yourselves, and to whom, if you examine ancient records, *you* ought to be subject; or, at least, laying aside all rancour, should reign together with them, on terms of equality and peace. Instead of which, by your pride and wickedness, moved

by no reason, but the mere force of power, you are trying to oppress your spiritual mother the Scottish Church, which has been free from the beginning; which church, by leading you out of the devious paths of heathenism, into the way of truth and life, brought you to Christ, washed your kings, nobles, and people, in the holy water of baptism; taught you the precepts of religion, and gladly undertook to supply you with instruction, and daily spiritual nourishment, without price. Nay, by the testimony of your own Bede, our church consecrated and ordained your bishops and priests, holding, for upwards of thirty years, the primacy and the highest pontifical dignity north of the river Thames.[1] What recompense, I ask, do you render for such favours? Bondage, forsooth! in other words, evil for good; even as Judas rendered unto Christ. We expected grapes, but you yield wild grapes: we expected righteousness, but you are unjust: we looked for judgment, but behold oppression. For shame! What can be more deplorable than for us to reap injuries where we have sown benefits? The vice of ingratitude is worse than the poison of serpents. I am of Seneca's opinion, who says, 'That men hate those whom they have injured, even more than they hate an enemy.' And what says David? 'They returned me evil for good, and hatred for my good will.' And thou, O Church of England, art kicking against the pricks in attempting to carry thy point by violence. If thou wilt not listen to me, I will protest against the subjection of the Scottish Church, though all our clergy should agree to it. I will appeal to the Roman see, to which alone we are subject. If I must die, I will

[1] The speaker here probably refers to the primacy of Iona, and to the conversions made by the Scottish bishops, Aidan, Finnan, and Colman, in the seventh century, in the kingdom of Northumbria. Aidan is said to have baptized many thousands of the Northumbrians in the course of a few days.

submit my neck to the sword; for I consider it more honest to refuse at once what is asked, than to enter into a controversy concerning it."

When Gilbert had finished this speech, some of the English themselves complimented him, because he had fearlessly defended his church, unappalled by the dignity of the assembly. Others, on the contrary, denounced him as a frothy and impetuous Scot. But the Archbishop of York suddenly closed the meeting; and rising with a significant smile upon his countenance, patted the speaker on the head, and said—"Ex propria pharetra non exiit ista sagitta." In the end, the Scottish bishops were obliged to evade, by a sort of diplomacy, what they could not accomplish by other means. They consented to the insertion of a clause in the treaty for their king's ransom, by which they engaged that the Scottish Church should yield that submission to the English Church which it was *wont* and *ought* to yield; that the latter should have that right over the former to which it was *legally entitled*; and that the Scottish bishops should not oppose themselves to this right.[1]

After returning home, and consulting with their brethren, our bishops resolved to send messengers to the pope to solicit his mediation in their behalf, and to free them from this state of questionable subjection. The favourable result is thus told by Wyntoun:—

> The Pope Alexander honourably
> Ressaved their message, and thankfully

[1] Collier the historian calls this "owning their dependency on the Church of England," without noticing the manifest *equivoque*. The original words are, Concesserunt quod Ecclesia Scoticana talem subjectionem amodò faciat ecclesiæ Anglicanæ qualem illi facere debet et solebat; and, also, that Ecclesia Anglicana habent in Ecclesia Scotiæ quod de jure habere debet, et quod ipsi (the Scottish bishops) non erunt contra jus Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Rymer, vol. i. p. 39. See also Tytler, *in loco*.

Renewed all their pryvylege,
Their customis and their avantage,
That they had lawful before those days;
Our byshopis to be always
Submittyd immediate to the pope
And to nane other archbyshop.
And by the popis authority
They gat them loosed quite and free
Of the fealty and the band,
That to the kyng then of England,
They had made to this Henry,
That treated them dispitiously.

Bishop Richard gave to the priory the churches of St Andrews, Inchsture, Egglesgreig, and Fowls, besides other gifts which are specified in the Register. p. 132–141. In p. 338, there is the following curious order issued by him respecting the workmen who were engaged, during his episcopate, in building the cathedral church:—"Richard, by the grace of God Bishop of St Andrews, to his bailies and burgesses of St Andrews, *salutem:* Seeing it is my duty to provide for the building of the new church of St Andrews, and to remove every impediment to its progress, I hereby forbid, on pain of forfeiture, any one to interfere with the plasterers, (cementarios,) masons, (quarriarios,) modellers, (taliarios,)[1] or any other workmen engaged about the church, without leave from the canon who has charge of the work. I desire also and command, that the workmen have liberty to buy food and clothing, the same as any other burgess or stall-keeper (homines stalagii) without hinderance, so long as they are occupied about the work; and that no one exact from them stallage, or any other dues, unless they pay them of their own accord; but if any of them have a house or land in the burgh, let them pay the customary dues. Farewell." Signed by eight witnesses.

The Excerpta of the Magnum Registrum state, that

[1] Talare, tailler, tailleur, taylor, a shaper or cutter.

Richard gave the church and land of Login-dunde to the abbey of Scone. He also confirmed to the monks of Dunfermline "the churches of Perth, St Leonards, Glinen-villa, Stirling, Kellin, Abercromby, Nithbren, Kilglessin, Inveresk, Wimet, Hala, Newton, and Wester-Calder, with their chapels and tithes, and the schools of Perth and Stirling."[1]

This bishop died, says Fordun, "in infirmatorio canonicorum," from which it may be inferred, that the bishop's customary place of residence at this time was the priory. The episcopal castle was not built till the beginning of the next century.

A thousand hundyre and twenty year,
And aucht to them full reckon'd clear,
Rychard, of Sanct Andrewys than
Byshop, commendyt a gude man,
Hys soul yhald to hys Creatour,
Hys body til hallowed sepulture,
Even upon the thyrd day
Of that moneth that we call May.
Intil Sanct Andrewys kyrk he lies,
Hys spyrit is intil paradys.
He was, the tyme that he lived here,
Of the kyrk a stark pillere,
Defendyt gart the kyrk be weel,
In all its freedomis ilka deal.

I have an impression both of the seal and counter-seal of this bishop. In the centre of the former is the figure of the bishop holding his crosier, with the legend, Sigillum Ricardi Dei gracia Scotorum Episcopi. On the latter are two stags drawing a car, with the words, Secretum fracta reveld.; the last word being probably a contraction for revelandum.

The prior of the monastery, during the foregoing episcopate, was Walter, who succeeded Robert the first prior. He had been previously Chantor of the church. During a period of twenty-four years, he

[1] Register, p. xl.

governed the monastery with prudence, and was at last obliged to resign on account of bodily infirmity. He was succeeded by Gilbert, who is mentioned, in p. 40 of the Register, as entering into an agreement with Bernard Fraser and the heirs of Drem. After the death of the latter, Walter, having recovered, resumed his former office, and lived till the end of the century. His name occurs in the Register, as being concerned in leasing out certain lands and tithes, pp. 306, 325. He was alive in A.D. 1195, p. 323.

XXI. Hugh and John, a disputed election, A.D. 1178–1188.

On the death of Bishop Richard, the chapter chose in his place, John Scott archdeacon of St Andrews. Scott was an Englishman, and had graduated both at Oxford and Cambridge; after which he chanced to visit St Andrews, where he was kindly received by the late bishop. He thus formed a connexion with the clergy here, which led to his being made archdeacon. When the bishop himself died a few years after, and when the parties concerned in choosing a successor were assembled in the presence of John cardinal of St Stephen de Cœlio Monte, the pope's legate in Scotland, their unanimous choice fell upon the archdeacon. But an unexpected obstacle soon presented itself to this election. King William had designed the bishopric of St Andrews for Hugh, his own chaplain; and with the violence which marked his character, when he found that his choice was opposed, he swore "by the arm of St James," his favourite oath, that none but Hugh should obtain the situation. He therefore commanded the chapter to annul Scott's election, and to prefer Hugh in his place; and sent the Bishop of Glasgow to see that they complied

with his demand. The royal favourite, thus powerfully supported, was elected; but his rival, unwilling to abandon what he deemed to be his right, appealed in person to Pope Alexander III. The pontiff decided in his favour; and sent one Alexius as his legate into Scotland, with a peremptory order to see Scott duly consecrated and installed. The consecration was performed by the Bishop of Aberdeen, at Holyrood House, Edinburgh, in the presence of a large concourse of church dignitaries. William could not prevent this; but he took effectual means to hinder Scott from drawing any part of the revenues of the see. In this unpleasant dilemma, the latter went a second time to the court of Rome, to submit his case to Alexander. But we will allow Wyntoun to tell the story in his own simple style:—

This byshop Rychard on this wyse was dead,
Chosen was intil hys stead,
Master John Scot that was than
A great clerk and a famous man.
The Kyng William, nevertheless,
Highly amoved thereat was,
And stood this gude man hale again,[1]
In favour of hys awn chapilaine
And hys confessor, Syre Hugh,
A famous man of gude vertue.
Master John Scot, nevertheless,
That chosen of the chapiter was,
Followed on hys richt sa fast
That o'er sea to the court he past.
There he shewed the decreet
To the Pope Alexander that yet
The thyrd that held the Papis see,
As twenty year before did he.[2]
That decreet then seen and read,
And the election in law all led,
And at a great council there,
Where gadryd mony byshopis were,
This 'lect intil Sanct Andrewys see
The pope then gart confirmed be
To use hys jurisdictioun,
And of hys consecratioun

[1] Against. [2] Alexander III. was pope from 1159 till 1181.

This Alexander the thyrd pope
Wrote til Syre Walter the byshop,
That that tyme was of Aberdeene,
As tyme and stead to that was seene,
This 'lect John Scot he suld bless,[1]
Since he confermyd and chosen was.
This John confermyd then byshop,
Alexander the thyrd, that tyme pope,
Sent with hym a messengere,
In Scotland to ken of that mattere,
For reverence of St Andrewys see
And of the kyngis dignitye.
The messengere that was sent for this
Call'd by name was Alexis,
That with John this byshop come
In Scotland fra the court of Rome,
Havand full authoritye
And power fra the papis see,
All that mattere for to knaw,
And do that suld be done by law.
Thus when they came into the land
The Kyng William of Scotland
Highly stood yet them again
In favour hale of his chapilaine,
And so were gret councils sere,[2]
Halden oft of this mattere
By this legatis authoritye.
And so with law proceeded he
That clerkis of the kingis council,
Chosen till him for special,
Cursed were solemnly,
And so denounced were highly
For the kyngis wilfulness.
The byshopric of Sanct Andrewys was
Interdycted then a whyle,
The land was set in sic peryle;
For the byshop of Aberdeen
(The popis letters, fra he had seen,)
Passed til the Halyrood House,
Where gadryd were mony religious
Abbotis, prioris, and prelatis,
And some byshopis of great statis,
At the feast of Trinity.
This byshop John then blessed he.
The Kyng William, nevertheless,
So stedfast to hys chapilaine was
That of the byshopric quite
Fra John he took the hale profite;
And for fear of the kyng,
He made in Scotland short dwelling.

[1] Consecrate. [2] Several.

Without a byshopric a byshop,[1]
This John again passed to the pope.
After that this all thus was done,
The byshopric of Dunkelden soon
Fell vacand, and the pope gave that
Til this John Scot. Fra he it gat,
Content in some sort then was he,
And Hugh held fast St Andrewys see.
So was appeased all debatis,
An reconciled well all statis.

From the above account it might be supposed that no events of importance occurred between Scott's second appeal to Rome, and his reception of the bishopric of Dunkeld. Yet there were several, which, though omitted by Wyntoun, (for the sake of brevity, I suppose,) ought to be detailed in an ecclesiastical history of St Andrews.

When Scott had represented to the Roman court that he was

Without a byshopric a byshop,

the pope instantly excommunicated his rival for contumacy, and appointed the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Durham with full power to excommunicate the king, and lay the whole country under an interdict, if Scott should be denied peaceable possession of his bishopric. William, no less determined, met this menace by proclaiming sentence of banishment against every person in his dominions, whether lay or clerical, who should presume to obey the papal injunction. He seems to have been proud of opposing to the uttermost that pontiff before whom his conqueror Henry II. had bowed, in the case of Thomas à Becket. John now offered to resign his preten-

[1] The original is, *bot, but a byshapryk a byschape.* This is a good specimen of the etymological meanings of *bot* and *but*. See *Diversions of Purley*, vol. i. p. 215. Had the ingenious author of this most useful work been acquainted with Wyntoun's Chronicle, he would, no doubt, have drawn many of his examples from it.

sions, but the pope required him, by his clerical obedience, to stand firm and maintain his post. The Bishop of Durham, taking John with him, had an interview with the king, but without the desired effect. The interdiction of the see of St Andrews, the excommunication of Hugh, and the menaces issued against the king, had all proved unsuccessful. Alexander now lost all patience. Thwarted and disobeyed, he directed an epistle to William, and commanded him to install John within twenty days, under pain of excommunication. "If you persist in your obstinacy and outrage," he said, "you may rest assured that, as in times past I have laboured to procure the freedom of your church, so will I make it my study, in time to come, that it may return to its ancient servitude." Henry II. now offered his mediation to terminate this unhappy quarrel; the result of which was, that William offered to confer upon Scott some compensation for the loss he sustained. But the pope would listen to no compromise, and William would make no farther concessions. Both parties had now proceeded so far that neither could well retreat. The two English prelates summoned the clergy of the diocese of St Andrews to yield obedience to John under pain of excommunication. William banished all who yielded this obedience. The prelates then resorted to the utmost limit of their power, and fulminated the awful sentence of excommunication and interdict against the king and the whole people of Scotland.

The following year (1181) the king, experiencing the painful consequences of this sentence, sent ambassadors to Rome, with the following offers towards an accommodation:—That, on the interdict being withdrawn, he would recall his sentences of banishment; that Scott should be allowed to enjoy the preferments which he held before his election, with a

pension of forty marks a-year, and be put into the first bishopric that should become vacant. Alexander rejected these offers; but, dying a few months after, William lost no time in sending the Bishop of Glasgow and the Abbots of Kelso and Melrose, with a renewal of them to Lucius III., his successor. Happily these prelates met with a favourable reception, and were so far successful in their negotiation, that they procured a bull, (which is dated 18th March, 1182,) removing the interdict, and absolving all who had been excommunicated. This was owing, in part, to the earnest intercession of Scott himself, who told the pope he could not bear the idea of the whole of Scotland suffering in its spiritual interests on his account. Lucius, as a farther mark of his regard for William, sent him a *rose of gold* with his benediction, and nominated two new legates to determine the dispute between the rival candidates. William, through these legates, offered to Scott the see of Dunkeld which was now vacant, the chancellorship of the kingdom, and his pension of forty marks, if he would renounce all claims on the disputed bishopric. To this Scott agreed, but on the condition that his opponent Hugh should equally renounce *his* claims. This arrangement being acceded to, the pope summoned both parties to appear before him at Viterbo; to which place they repaired accordingly in the year 1183, and resigned into the hands of his holiness all right to the contested bishopric. A few days after, Lucius, in a full consistory of cardinals, gave St Andrews to Hugh, and placed Scott in the inferior see of Dunkeld, engaging at the same time, that all the other promises made to the latter should be fulfilled. But this tedious and entangled controversy did not yet end. Lucius died two years after this; and Scott, who had reason to hope for more favour

from his successor, again put in a claim for St Andrews, on the plea that the terms of his engagement had not been complied with. The new pope, Clement III., listening to his complaint, issued a mandate appointing certain commissioners of inquiry to summon Hugh before them, and to suspend him if refractory. The latter, supported by the king, resisted; and, in consequence, the pope, by a bull dated 16th January 1188, declared the see of St Andrews vacant, suspended the bishop, and directed the chapter to proceed to a new election; intimating to them, at the same time, his desire that they would reëlect Scott. He, moreover, requested William to withdraw his opposition, and even wrote to the King of England to solicit his mediation in behalf of his favourite. Besides this, he directed some of the Scottish bishops to go to St Andrews, and, if they found any improper changes to have been there made by Hugh, to correct them by his authority. But all this opposition on the part of the pope proved ineffectual; for Scott, finding the aversion of the king towards him to be unconquerable, and that he could not hope to enjoy the see of St Andrews in peace, finally withdrew his pretensions; and Hugh, going to Rome and making his submission, was absolved, and confirmed in his situation; "a memorable triumph," says Tytler, "which, at a time when the proudest monarchs of Europe were compelled to tremble before the terrors of the popedom, does honour to the courage and independence of the Scottish king." Hugh, however, did not long survive this favourable turn of his affairs; for, during his sojourn at Rome, he was suddenly carried off by the plague which was then raging in that city.

William had, moreover, the interest to procure from the same pope, a bull exempting Scotland from the operation of all interdicts and excommunications but

such as should proceed direct, *nullo mediante*, from the Roman pontiff.[1]

It deserves to be recorded of Scott, that when he had taken possession of the bishopric of Dunkeld, he found it too extensive for his episcopal control; and that besides, in the Argyllshire part of it, the Gaelic language alone was spoken, with which he was unacquainted. He therefore applied to the pope for his sanction to have it divided into two dioceses, Dunkeld and Argyll, proposing, at the same time, that over the latter, a native bishop should be appointed; and, though this considerably reduced his income, it seems to have given him no uneasiness where the spiritual interests of his people were concerned. The pope complied with his desire, expressing himself much gratified by this mark of his piety and disinterestedness; and appointed Evaldus, one of Scott's own chaplains, the first bishop of the new diocese. Argyll made the eleventh bishopric in Scotland.

The Register of the Priory mentions Bishop Hugh as entering into a convention with Duncan earl of Fife, regarding their respective mills at Dairsey, p. 352; as giving half a silver mark yearly from his mill of Dairsey to the priory, p. 44; and as being deprived of the patronage of that parish, because he had exercised it at the time he was excommunicated by the pope, p. 83.[2]

The same document, p. 28, gives the following statement of the revenues of the Scottish bishopries. No date is affixed to it; but, as it contains the see of Argyll, and not that of the Isles which was erected

[1] See Appendix X.

[2] The "Excerpta" of the Magnum Registrum, p. xxix, mention that this bishop confirmed to the Abbey of Scone the following churches or chapels granted by his predecessors:—Kinfauns, Cragy, Rate, Liff, Innergoury, Rankismuth, Lachor, and Bermount.

about the year 1270, it must have been made soon after the time now under our review.

	£	sol.	den.
Aberdeen,	1610	9	4
Caithness,	286	14	10
Ross,	351	19	8
Moray,	1413	15	7
Argyll,	280	26	8
Galloway,	353	0	15
Brechin,	416	0	40
Dunblane,	507	13	4
Dunkeld,	1206	5	8
Glasgow,	4080	13	3
St Andrews,	3013	3	0[1]

The calculation is, that £1 in the twelfth century would equal £5 at present. If, consequently, we multiply the foregoing sums by 5, we shall have the incomes of the Scottish bishopries at that period expressed in modern money. The pound sterling was then common to both countries.

XXII. Roger, A.D. 1188–1202.

Roger was son of the Earl of Leicester, and cousin to King William of Scotland, who made him first his chancellor, then Abbot of Melrose, and afterwards Bishop of St Andrews. But when he succeeded to the bishopric, he resigned the chancellorship in favour of Hugh de Scalle the king's clerk.[2] He built the castle of St Andrews in the year 1200, as a residence for himself and his successors. Hitherto the bishops had lived in the priory, and, before that was constructed, in the Culdean monastery of Kirkheugh.

This Rogere
The Erle's son was of Laycestere.
The castell in his dayis he
Founded and gart bigged be

[1] See the episcopate of Bishop Wishart, chap. vi.
[2] Sir J. Balfour's Annals.

In Sanct Andrewys, in that place
Where now that castell bigged was.
Syre Andrew Murray cast it down,
For there he found a garrysoun
Of English men intil that place;
For the see then vacand was,
As ye shall hear after soon
When all the lave til it is done.

In these last words, Wyntoun is anticipating an event which did not occur for more than a hundred years after, and of which we shall hear in its proper place.

"Ten years," says Spotswood, "this bishop stood elect; and was not consecrated before the year of God 1198, at which time Richard bishop of Moray, the pope's legate, performed the ceremony" in the presence of King William. The cause of this delay in the bishop's consecration is not stated; but it probably arose from another interference on the part of the Archbishop of York; for we find that King William sought and obtained from Pope Celestine III. a bull, dated in 1192, confirming that of his predecessor in favour of the independence of the Church of Scotland of all foreign jurisdiction, except that of Rome itself.

In 1201, Innocent III., Celestine's successor, sent a cardinal legate, John of Salerne, into Scotland, who held a council at Perth for making some new canons. These canons have all been lost, except one which enjoined the Sunday to be kept from twelve o'clock noon on the Saturday till Monday morning; and another which removed from the service of the altar all those who had been ordained on a Sunday: the object of which injunctions it is not very easy to perceive, unless we may remark in them an attempt to revive a pharasaical observance of the first day of the week. Some disputes were also settled at this council, particularly one between the Bishops of St Andrews and

Glasgow on the one hand, and the Abbot and monks of Kelso on the other, as to the supplying with vicars the churches belonging to the latter which were situated within the dioceses of the said bishops. The result of this seems to have been a deed, still preserved in the Chartulary of Kelso, wherein Bishop Roger confirms to that monastery the free and uncontrolled administration of all their churches and chapels situated within his diocese.

The Register of the Priory, p. 147–153, shows that Bishop Roger, besides confirming various properties previously granted to it, conferred upon it the church of Forgan in Gowrie. The charter which conveys this grant is dated "in the third year of our pontificate." In p. 318, there is a document to which he is the first witness, giving an account of a dispute between the canons-regular and the Culdees of St Andrews. The matter is adjusted, by the former conceding to the latter the tithes of Kingasc (Kinglasse), Kinnakelle cum Petsporgin, Petkennen, Lethene (Letham), cum Kininis (Kinness), Kernes (Cairns), cum Cambrun (Cameron); but retaining to themselves those of Tristyrum (Stratyrum), together with the oblations of marriages, churchings, and baptisms, at the above-mentioned places.

Bishop Roger seems to have been much in England from 1199 till 1201; for, in the "Rotuli Chartarum in turri Londinensi," his name often occurs during these years, as a witness to charters granted by King John to various public bodies.

"Four years," says Spotswood, "did this bishop live after his consecration, and died at Cambuskenneth, July 9, 1202; his remains being with great solemnity conveyed to St Andrews, and interred in the old church of St Rule." Wyntoun adds, that the following inscription was written and placed near his tomb:—

Qui peregrinus ades, sta, respice; prima Robertum,
Arnaldum reliquum, circundat tumba Rogerum
Ultima; pontifices quondam, cœli modo cives.

That is, "Passenger, stop and behold! the first tomb contains Robert, the next Arnold, the last Roger. On earth they were bishops, now they are citizens of heaven."

In Anderson's Diplomata there are copies of two seals of this bishop; the first, when he was elect only, has his figure holding a rod in one hand, and a book in the other, his body being bare from the waist upwards, with the legend "Robertus, Dei gracia electus Sancti Andree." The other is after he was consecrated, in his mitre and robes, holding a crosier in his left hand, with the words "Robertus, Dei gracia Scotorum episcopus." This is another of the numberless proofs of the great importance attached to episcopal consecration, even in what are called the dark ages of the church. The bishop elect, though in the possession and administration of his diocese, acquired, by this means, a new title, a new seal of office, a distinguishing dress, and an additional spiritual authority.

XXIII. William Malvoisine, A.D. 1202–1238.

This prelate passed his youth in France, and is even called a Frenchman by some writers. He was at least of French extraction, as his name denotes. He became Lord Chancellor of Scotland, and was Bishop of Glasgow before being translated to St Andrews.

Then the byshop Roger dead,
Of Sanct Andrewys, intil that stead,
And there to be byshop syne,
Translatyd was Williame Maivysyne;
Byshop before that of Glasgow
The kyrk hallowed of Sanct Mungo.

And the translatioune of that
Was that tyme done by a legat
That called than was John by name,
At the instans of the kyng Williame.

The ceremony here alluded to, of translating the bishop from Glasgow to St Andrews, was performed at Scone in the month of October. The legate was probably John of Salerne, mentioned under the last episcopate.

In 1206, a misunderstanding having arisen between the Kings of England and Scotland,—the Bishops of Glasgow and St Andrews, Cumyn Justice-General, and Philip de Valence Lord Chamberlain, were sent as ambassadors to King John.

In 1211, Malvoisine resigned the office of chancellor, on which William de Bosco archdeacon of St Andrews, was appointed to succeed him. This Bosco was afterwards made Bishop of Dunblane.

The same year, in virtue of a commission from Pope Innocent III., this bishop, together with Walter bishop of Glasgow, held a council at Perth, with a view to promote an expedition to the Holy Land. The clergy and commonalty entered warmly into the scheme; but the nobility betrayed great lukewarmness in the cause; which was probably owing to the deplorable fate of five hundred of their countrymen, mostly noblemen and gentlemen, who, not long before, accompanied Earl David, the brother of their king, in his expedition to the east, and who nearly all perished, except their leader, after suffering incredible hardships. He himself landed with great difficulty at Dundee, where, in gratitude for his deliverance, he built the large and handsome church which was recently destroyed by fire, and annexed it to the abbey of Lindores, which he also founded.

The next act in which we find Malvoisine engaged, was in crowning King Alexander II. at Scone, when

he was sixteen years of age. He had also christened him when an infant. The year following, the young king sent the bishop, along with several noblemen, to King John, on a political mission,—"Propter nostra negotia quæ habemus erga vos, et in curia vestra agenda."

A general council was held at Rome in 1215, at which Innocent III. presided in person, and preached the opening sermon. It was attended by four hundred and ten prelates, including the Bishops of St Andrews, Glasgow, and Moray, and the Abbot of Kelso. There, measures were agreed on for suppressing those religious sects known by the names of Waldenses and Albigenses, who had long persevered in refusing subjection to the see of Rome.[1] There, too, proposals were discussed for the recovery of the Holy Land from the infidels: auricular confession was enjoined on all Catholics; and, instead of a weekly celebration of the holy communion, which had been practised by the members of the Church of Rome herself for, at least, the first three hundred years of her existence, the laity were now required to communicate only once a-year, namely, at Easter. Lastly, the doctrine of transubstantiation was, for the first time, submitted to the consideration of a general council, and a partial assent obtained to it, though it was not generally embraced till two hundred years after this; on which we may remark, in passing, that the corruptions of Romanism had their origin, not in the primitive, but in the middle ages of the Church.[2]

[1] Protestant writers show great favour to all who were persecuted by the Roman Catholic Church; but often on insufficient grounds. The Waldenses seem to have been an inoffensive sect; but the Albigenses were unquestionably heretical. They rejected all the Old Testament, and a great part of the New; and denied the reality of our Saviour's death and resurrection. See Hallam's Middle Ages, vol. iii. p. 462–473.

[2] The same remark holds good, not only of auricular confession, yearly communion, and transubstantiation, but of the adoration and invocation of angels and saints; especially the blessed Virgin Mary,

In the year following this, the whole of Scotland was laid under an interdict by the spiritual tyranny of Innocent III., for no better reason than because our king, with the advice of his clergy, had presumed to assist France in her war against the King of England, contrary to the command of his holiness! A more outrageous instance of oppression, on the part of the papal legates, or of degradation in a Christian country, it is hardly possible to imagine. The churches were closed, the bells silent, and the dead buried without solemnity; the penalty falling on those who had not partaken of the offence, and that offence being a political dispute, in which the pride of the pope had been wounded! The king, it seems, had made his peace with the pope: but not so the clergy, excepting only the Bishop of St Andrews, who was not implicated, from the circum-

images and relics; papal supremacy; infallibility; elevation, adoration, and procession of the host; refusal of the cup to the laity; sacrificial masses for the living and the dead; purgatory; tradition as equal to Scripture; indulgences, and the sale of them; lay baptism; burning of heretics; deposition of heretical kings; papal interdicts on a whole nation; forced celibacy; prayers in an unknown tongue; works of supererogation. I do not mention "the seven sacraments," because the dispute on that point depends on the meaning of the *word* sacrament: nor do I say anything respecting "prayers for the pious deceased," because that, we know, was practised in the earliest and purest age of the Church. I do not specify the doctrine of "justification by works," because I believe no more is meant by it than what is contained in the Epistle of St James. And, finally, as to the "burning of heretics," I am quite ready to admit, that when the Protestants got the power into their own hands, they made very nearly as bad a use of it as the Roman Catholics had done before them. But, with respect to the other points above enumerated, they may rest on the decrees of popes or of councils, or on the questionable authority of a very few of the later Fathers of the Church; but they rest on no authority of Scripture; and, what is of no less importance to remark, they had no countenance from the Church of Rome herself, during the first three or four hundred years of her existence. If that Church would renounce these errors, and become *what she once was*, it would be the duty of all Christians to unite themselves to her communion; or, rather, she would then be one and the same with the Reformed Catholic Church already existing in the British dominions.

stance of his having been in France when the quarrel originated.

> The archbyshop of York that year,
> By authoryty and powere
> Of the pope, assoyled[1] then
> Alexander our kyng, and his lawd[2] men.
> But the byshopis and the clergy
> Yet he left in cursing lye,
> All but of Sanct Andrewys see
> The byshop Williame, for cause that he
> In the kynrick was of France
> In the tyme of this disturbance.

And then follows an account of the shameless extortion practised by the papal legate on the Scottish clergy, at which even Wyntoun is so indignant, that he finishes his narrative by observing—

> All thus he used his malice
> Againis Scotland mony wise.

The clergy, justly offended at such insolent and avaricious conduct, sent two of their bishops to complain of it to the pope. On inquiry, it was admitted that the legate had exceeded his powers; but his only punishment was, his being deprived of part of the booty which he had extorted.

During this episcopate, Pope Honorius III., besides confirming the bulls of his predecessors, as to the independence of the Church in Scotland, issued a mandate, dated in 1225,[3] authorizing its bishops, as they had no metropolitan, to hold provincial councils periodically, under the presidency of one of their number, whom they should choose for the occasion, and who was to be named "Conservator totius cleri Scoticani." The Bishop of St Andrews, it is to be observed, had always enjoyed a certain precedence of rank over his brethren.

[1] Absolved. [2] Lay-men. [3] Appendix XIII.

His see, though not the most ancient, was by far the most opulent in Scotland, to the possession of which the other bishops looked forward as the final object of their ambition. His name was always written first in the lists of witnesses to public documents. He was often named "Pontiff," and his chair called the "pontifical chair of St Andrews." For many ages, he was styled "maximus episcopus Scotorum;" or, latterly, "episcopus Scotorum;" while the other bishops were named from their respective dioceses. Still, he was not, at the time under our review, the acknowledged *primate* of Scotland; nor did he become so till nearly two hundred and fifty years after; and hence arose the expediency of one of the bishops being nominated as a *pro tempore* head of the Church, who should convene councils, and serve as an umpire for the decision of ecclesiastical questions of importance. The only priority assigned to the Bishop of St Andrews on this occasion, was, that he was to be the *first* conservator in point of time. There is, in the Register of the diocese of Moray, the form by which this functionary summoned his council. He there charges each bishop to give his presence at the place of meeting on a particular day, and to bring with him, attired in their proper robes, the abbots, and priors, with proctors from the chapters, colleges, and convents of the diocese, in order to treat of the reformation of the Church, and such other matters as might come before them.[1] This privilege of the Scottish Church gave it an independence which it never afterwards lost; and protected it not only from the ambitious attempts of the see of York, but, in some measure, from the usurpations of Rome itself.

[1] A copy of this document is given by Sibbald in his "Independence of the Scots Church."

In Dalrymple's Annals of Scotland[1] may be seen the canons which these provincial councils enacted. They are eighty-four in number; and, with the exception of those opinions and practices which are peculiar to Romanism, nothing can be more praiseworthy than the rules they enjoin, and the discipline they prescribe. Had they been enforced, and had the Church been less wealthy, in all human probability there never would have been a Reformation in Scotland.

Bishop Malvoisine was the first who introduced the order of Dominican monks into Scotland, where they founded no less than fifteen monasteries within a very short time. One of these, we shall soon see, was established in St Andrews. He also founded the monastery of Scotland-well, near Lochleven. It appears, from the foundation-charter of this monastery, that the bishop "grants to God, and the Hospital of St Mary of Lochleven, the church of the Holy Trinity of Monzie, for the sustentation of the poor resorting thither." And his successor, Bishop Bernham, in confirming the same, adds, "that he designs it for God and St Mary, and the brothers of the order of the Holy Trinity, and of captives," which is understood to mean that the brothers of this order were bound to use their endeavours to redeem Christian captives from bondage.

Malvoisine also wrote the lives of St Ninian and St Kentigern. "The rents alienated by his predecessors, or lost by their negligence, he recovered to his see; advanced the fabric of the cathedral (which was then building) more than any that went before him; and suffered no man, of what quality soever he was, to usurp upon the church or its possessions."[2] Sir J. Balfour, in his Annals, records two consecrations by

[1] Vol. iii. p. 144–198. [2] Spotswood, lib. ii.

this bishop; one in 1213, of Adam abbot of Melrose, who was made Bishop of Caithness; and the other in 1233, of Clement, a friar-predicant, who was made Bishop of Dunblane.

This bishop does not appear, from the Register of the Priory, to have conferred any gifts on that establishment; but he confirmed some previous grants which had been made to it, on the condition of the prior and canons applying the fruits of them to the construction of the cathedral. This was the case with the churches of Lathrisk and Scoonie, the chapel of Kettle, and the Pentecostal offerings of his own diocese, p. 156–160. He also gave the church of Kege to the Culdean monastery of Monymusk, and enacted some regulations for its government, with a view to making it more dependent upon himself, p. 370.[1] After an episcopate of thirty-six years at St Andrews, besides two at Glasgow, he died at his palace of Inchmurtach, and was the first bishop who was buried in the cathedral church, the choir of which was by this time probably completed.

In hallowyd sepulture
Hys body laid was wyth honoure,
Wyth honourabil byshopis twa,
Of Dunkelden and Dunblane were tha,
Wyth other sundry gret prelatis,
And famous clerkis of high statis.
In the new kyrk hys body lyes,
Hys spyrit intil paradyse.

I have casts of the seal and counterseal of this bishop, though somewhat mutilated. On the first is

[1] He is said to have delighted in the pleasures of the table, rather than in the austeries of the cloister. It is recorded by Fordun, that he deprived the abbey of Dunfermline of the collation of two vicarages, Kinglassy and Hales, because its monks had neglected to supply him with wine enough for his supper! The historian adds, that the monks had provided a sufficient quantity of wine, but that the bishop's attendants, as fond of it as their master, had improvidently consumed it all. Lib. vi. c. 42.

the bishop, with his crosier, and the words "Sigill. Willi. ..... Scotorum Episcopi." On the other, is the same device, but on a smaller scale, with the words "Secretum Sancti Andree."

There were three priors of the monastery during the foregoing episcopate. Walter was, as we have seen, p. 89, alive in 1195. To him, a year or two after, succeeded Thomas, who had previously been sub-prior; a man, says Fordun,[1] "bonæ conversationis, et totius religionis exemplar." His name occurs only once in the Register, p. 329, as being a party to an exchange of the "terra de Sconin," for the "terra de Gariad." But in the preface to that volume, he is mentioned, p. xlii, as complaining to Pope Innocent III., that the Bishop of Dunkeld had thrust an incumbent into the parish church of Meigle, without the consent of himself and his convent, its lawful patrons. Some of his brethren, it seems, were stirred up against him, on account of his zeal in enforcing the rules of their order; on which account he chose to withdraw from their society, rather than countenance their errors By remaining among them. Accordingly, in the year 1211, he gave up the dignity of the priorate, and bade farewell to his brethren, many of whom would gladly have retained him, and shed tears at his departure. He retired to the monastery at Coupar.

The prior who succeeded him was Simon, a canon of the same house; "vir," says Fordun, "honestæ vitæ et laudabilis conversationis. But he lived in evil times, and was taught in the school of adversity. Turning away, therefore, from the snares of the malicious, and the calumnies of the envious, he gave up his office in the year 1225, with the consent of the

[1] When I quote Fordun, it is to be understood that I include his continuator Bower. The latter, it is well known, carried on the Scotichronicon, from materials furnished in a great measure by the former.

bishop and his brethren, and was removed to the inferior priorate of Lochleven." This account of Simon agrees with the mention made of him in the Register. He seems to have been of a litigious temper. He had a controversy with the Archdeacon of St Andrews, p. 315; a second with one "Master Patrick and the poor scholars of St Andrews," p. 316; a third with the "brother hospitalers of Torphichen," p. 320; and a fourth with "Bernard Fraser and the heirs of Drem." All these related to different kinds of property which each party claimed.

The next prior was Henry de Norham, who had also been a canon of the monastery. All that Fordun says of him is, that he resigned in the year 1236, "leaving the monastery grievously burdened with debts and expenses." This was perhaps owing, in part, to the litigious processes of his predecessor. In the Register, there is mention of numerous matters in which "the prior and canons" generally were engaged, without specifying either the name of the prior, or the date of the transaction; but the only affairs of any moment in which prior Henry is mentioned by name, are—First, That Pope Gregory IX. commands him, the Archdeacon of St Andrews, and the Dean of Fife, to inquire into a complaint made by the monks of May against the monks of Scone, regarding a fishery at Inchyra on the river Tay, p. 393. Secondly, That he exempts the pilgrims' hospital, near the bridge of Lochleven, from the payment of tithes, p. 176. And, thirdly, That he gives the church of Rothes, in Aberdeenshire, to the hospital of St Nicholas on the Spey, on the condition of receiving from it three marks yearly, p. 326.

CHAPTER VI.

Lives and Times of the Bishops of St Andrews, from the Succession of David de Bernham in 1238, *till the Death of William de Lamberton in* 1328, *in whose Episcopate the Cathedral was completed, and dedicated in the presence of Robert the Bruce.*

XXIV. David de Bernham, A.D. 1238–1252.

In the year of Bishop Malvoisine's death and Bernham's succession, I have followed Wyntoun and Sir James Dalrymple rather than Keith, who closes the life of the former bishop in the year 1233. Sir James states, that he saw an indenture, dated 1237, with Malvoisine's seal attached to it, and that there is no known document of Bernham's earlier than 1240. The latter part of this statement is in accordance both with the Scotichronicon and the Register of the Priory.

The chapter of St Andrews postulated Gaufridus (whose name is variously written Gilifred, Giffred, and Jaffray) bishop of Dunkeld to this see, but the choice was not approved either by the king or the pope. Next year, in consequence, they proceeded to a new election, and chose David de Bernham chamberlain of the kingdom, who was accordingly consecrated on St Vincent's day, by the Bishops of Glasgow, Caithness, and Brechin.

> And efter that this Williame was dead
> There postuled was intil hys stead
> Of Dunkelden the byshop
> Jaffray. But til him the pope
> By na way grant wuld hys gude will;
> But leave the canons he gave til
> Again to mak electioun.
> And for to chuse a gude persoun

They chused this Davy of Bernhame,
Ane honest clerk and of gude fame,
Chaummerlayne that tyme of Scotland,
That to the pape was well lykand.
And in Scotland by byshopis three
Confermyd and sacryde both was he,
Of Glasgow, Brechin, and Catenes.
This Davy by them made byshop was.

The bishop soon after held a synod at Musselburgh, where he is said to have enacted some useful statutes; and afterwards a provincial council at Perth, where he presided in his capacity of *conservator cleri*. The king himself was present on the latter occasion, and enjoined his barons, under severe penalties, to refrain from injuring the church. He also took this opportunity of requiring from them a public recognition of his infant son as heir-apparent to his throne. This council published certain canons which were ratified by the king and the estates, and remained in force till the overthrow of the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland.

In the year 1245, Pope Innocent IV. summoned a general council at Lyons, and called to it, among others, the Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow. The Emperor of Germany, however, who knew that the pope was plotting mischief against him, and had called this council chiefly for the purpose of deposing him, waylaid the two Scottish bishops, and made them his prisoners; and only released them on the condition of their returning home again. This, however, did not save the unfortunate emperor from deposition, which was solemnly pronounced upon him by Innocent and his council, and all his subjects absolved from their allegiance.

I find the following brief notice in Sir J. Balfour's Annals, under the year 1247:—"This year, King Alexander, with advice of his three estates, altered the standard of his coin in a parliament holden at St Andrews." What was the precise nature of this

alteration I have not discovered. The Scottish value of money, as compared with the English, during the middle ages, is very complicated, because perpetually undergoing change.

When Alexander II. died, Henry III. of England despatched an envoy to the pope, soliciting a mandate to postpone the coronation of his son Alexander III., then only eight years old, until he, his feudal superior, as he styled himself, should give his consent; and, at the same time, requesting from his holiness a grant of a tenth of the ecclesiastical revenues of Scotland. To both these petitions the pope sent a peremptory refusal, and the ceremony of the coronation of the young prince was suffered to proceed. A numerous and brilliant concourse of the nobility and church dignitaries conducted their youthful sovereign to the ancient abbey of Scone on the 3d July 1249. But as it was thought he could not be crowned till he had been made a knight, the Bishop of St Andrews was directed first to gird the royal boy with the belt and spurs of knighthood; after which, he administered to him the coronation oath both in Latin and Norman-French, and then placed the crown upon his head. The assembled prelates and barons next installed the king in the ancient stone chair; and, having taken an oath of allegiance to his service, sat down to hear a sermon from our bishop. When that was concluded, a Highland seannachy addressed the king in the Celtic language, and, with a loud voice, deduced his descent through fifty-six generations, from Fergus the first King of the Scots in Albyn, tracing Fergus himself up to Scota, daughter of Pharaoh king of Egypt!

Wyntoun relates, that in the year 1250, the king and Bishop Bernham, with a "gret cumpany of erls, byshopis, and baronis, and mony famous and gret

persounis," assisted at the translation of St Margaret's remains from the nave of the abbey church of Dunfermline into the choir, in consequence of having been canonized; on which occasion an extraordinary circumstance occurred:—

The thryd Alexander bodyly
There was wyth a gret cumpany
Of erls, byshopis, and baronis,
And mony famous great persounis.
Of Sanct Andrewys there was by name
The byshop Davy of Bernhame;
Robert of Klydelith syne,
That abbot was of Dunfermlyne.
Power had they then at full,
Grawntit by the papys bull,
To make that translatioune.
And that to do they made them bowne,[1]
And fayndit[2] to gar the body
Translatit be of that lady.
Wyth all their power and their slycht
Her body to raise they had na mycht,
Nor lift her ance out of that place
Where she that tyme then lyand was,
For all their devotiounis
Prayeris and gret orisounis
That the persounis gadryd there
Did in that devout mannere;
Til first they took up the body
Of her lord that lay thereby,
And bare it ben[3] into the choire.
Lastly syne, in fayre mannere,
Her cors they tuk up and bare ben,
And there interred togedyr then.
So trowed they all then gadryd there
What honour til her lord she bare.
So this myracle to record
Notis gret reverence til her lord,
As she used in her lyfe,
When she was hys spoused wyfe.

"A more awkward miracle," says the sarcastic Hailes, "occurs not in legendary history."

The Register of the Priory does not record that

[1] Ready. [2] Attempted.

[3] *Ben* (be-in) in old Scotch signifies *within*, in opposition to *but* (be-out) which means *without*.

this bishop made any gifts to its canons, but merely confirmed those previously made by others, p. 161–170, but that he gave Dolbethoc to the canons of Monymusk, for the better sustenance of the poor pilgrims resorting to that monastery, p. 369. He also dedicated to particular saints, nine churches belonging to the priory which had hitherto been named simply from the places where they were situated, p. 348. The same document states, p. 26, that Innocent IV. had issued letters, enjoining the Bishop of Brechin and two others to summon before them Bishop Bernham and the Provost of the Culdees in St Andrews, to settle a dispute which they had had about rents, when the bishop's death put a stop to the proceeding.

The Denmylne charters[1] furnish us with a very spirited remonstrance to King Alexander III. by Bernham and his brother bishops, respecting some attacks which had been made on the property of the church by certain laymen. They entreat that the said property may be restored, and means used to hinder any like aggression in future; adding, that "They are prepared to make any sacrifice rather than connive at such sacrilegious robbery." What were the particulars of this affair we are not told; but we shall see, in the next episcopate but one, that Alexander, or rather those who guided his councils, were far from attending to this reasonable remonstrance of the bishops.

Having gone to England to assist at the marriage of Alexander to the daughter of Henry III. of England, Bishop Bernham was taken suddenly ill there: and, after lingering about twelve months, died, and was buried in the abbey church of Kelso. Wyntoun thus records his death, but does not seem to have entertained a very favourable opinion of him; for he does not send

[1] See Appendix VII., No. 39.

his "spyrit intil paradyse," which he uniformly does with his favourites; and he is evidently displeased with him for preferring to be buried at Kelso, rather than in his own cathedral church.[1]

> A thousand twa hundyr and fyfty year
> And twa to them to reckon clear,
> The byshop Davy of Bernhame
> Past aff this warld til his lang hame.
> As he did here, so fand he there.
> Of him I byde to speak na mare.
> He chused his laire intil Kelso,
> Nocht in the kyrk of Sanct Andro.

It was during this episcopate that Alexander III., having recovered the Western Islands of Scotland from the King of Norway, formed them into a bishopric, thus making the dioceses twelve in number. The Bishop of "the Isles," as he was designated, fixed his seat at the ancient church and monastery of Iona, or Icolmkill.

John White was prior of the monastery during the foregoing period, by whose industry its possessions, which had been wasted under the administration of some of his predecessors, were restored and augmented. He built the dormitory, refectory, and the great hall of the hospitium; and, after doing other good works, died in the year 1258. The Register mentions a few particulars concerning him: first, an agreement which he enters into with Duncan de Ramsay, by which the latter is to have his own chapel and chaplain at Clayton, on condition of his paying one pound of frankincense yearly to the priory, and not infringing on the rights of the parish church of Lathrisk, p. 328; second, a dispute

[1] I have read somewhere, but omitted to note the reference, that this bishop made himself very unpopular with his canons, and deprived them, on some pretext, of the church of Inchsture; but that, seized with compunction on his death-bed for this act of injustice, he restored it to them before he died. Wyntoun, being himself a canon of the same priory, would, no doubt, participate in the feeling of prepossession against him.

with the master and monks of Haddington, together with the prioress and nuns of the same place, respecting the tithes of the king's garden in that town, pp. 329, 331; and, third, a dispute with Duncan earl of Mar, conducted before the Abbot and Prior of Lindores, and the Prior of May, concerning the tithes of Tharflund and Miggaveth, in Aberdeenshire, which had been given to the priory by the said earl's father, p. 349. White also gives certain properties to the canons of Lochleven, he reserving the right to appoint their prior, and they being answerable to him "*de temporalibus*, and the observance of order," p. 121.[1] It was during this prior's time that the property of his church was seized by some of the king's courtiers, as will appear more fully in the sequel; but the Register contains no allusion to the fact, nor does even Wyntoun advert to it.

XXV. Abel, A.D. 1253–1254.

Through the influence of the king and the court, and the concurrence of the pope, this bishop was thrust upon the prior and canons against their consent: they having previously chosen Robert Scutuvillis or Stutevil dean of Dunkeld; "a man," says Fordun, "scientia et moribus preclarus." The chapter referred the matter, in the first instance, to Rome; and, on the other hand, the king despatched Abel himself, with certain ambassadors, to the same court. There it fell out, through the force of misrepresentation and bribery, that the suit of the dean was rejected, and Abel returned home invested with the episcopate.

Wyntoun, after mentioning the death of the late

[1] In the Spalding Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 317, there is given, from the "Errol Papers," a confirmation by this prior of the land of Rossinclerach to Gilbert de Haya, in return for the annual payment of a silver mark and a modicum of wine.

bishop, thus briefly expresses himself concerning Abel, of whom he seems to have formed even a worse opinion than of his predecessor:

Next hym, byshop, the sooth to tell,
Of Sanct Andrewys was Abel;
That he purchased of the pope.
Ane half year skant he was byshop.
That was too lang, as he hym bare
Til all that subject til hym were.

"To be revenged upon the canons," says Spotswood, "Abel behaved himself well-insolently, calling them in question upon every light occasion, and censuring them with great rigour; whereupon he became extremely hated." They write of him, that, in a vain-glorious humour, as he was one day walking in his church, he did, with a little chalk, draw this line upon the gate: 'Hæc mihi sunt tria, lex, canon, philosophia;' bragging of his knowledge and skill in these professions; and, that, going to church the next day, he found another line drawn beneath the former, which said, 'Te levant absque, tria, fraus, favor, vanosophia.' This did so gall him, as, taking bed, he died within a few days, having sate bishop ten months and two days only." He was buried before the high altar in the cathedral church.

This bishop procured from Innocent IV. a bull forbidding any one to exact ecclesiastical pensions or benefices from him, without his own consent, or by an express mandate from the pope.[1] This would seem to denote that some attempts of the kind had been made, under the sanction of royal authority. His name does not occur in the Register of the Priory.

XXVI. GAMELINE, A.D. 1254–1271.

Of Sanct Andrewys byshop syne
Next Abel was Syre Gamelyne;

[1] Appendix XIV.

And blessed was syne here at hame
By the byshop of Glasgow, Syre Williame.

At the time of Gameline's succession to the bishopric, Alexander III. was only thirteen years old, and was surrounded by the Cumyns, who, as regents, held the chief sway in Scotland. The bishop belonged to the political party who were opposed to them, which subjected him to much annoyance and persecution. The regents went so far as to forbid his consecration; but this, being a purely ecclesiastical affair, was performed, as we have just seen, by the Bishop of Glasgow, William de Bandington, who was of the same party with Gameline.

The documents I have given in the Appendix,[1] furnish abundant proofs of the existence of a conspiracy at this time, on the part of Alexander III. and his courtiers, to plunder the Church of Scotland generally, and more especially the bishopric and priory of St Andrews. I am not aware that any of our historians have brought this circumstance to light, or made more than a casual allusion to it; yet the fact is undeniable: and when we take into account the many historical examples of men guilty of this crime, who suffered from violent death, or failure of issue, or both, it will be difficult to avoid ascribing these calamities, which it is well known befell Alexander, to the cause I have mentioned. Even before Bishop Gameline's succession to his see, a similar vexatious annoyance had been practised by the same court. The two preceding bishops, as we have seen, had been subjected to a sacrilegious persecution, and had used means to ward off the blow, the one by a spirited remonstrance addressed to the king, the other by an application to Rome. But these means, if successful then, do not seem to have been equally so in the

[1] Appendices XIV., XVI., XVII., XVIII., XIX., XX., XXI.

present instance; not, at least, till after the expiration of a series of years.

In the very first year of Gameline's episcopate, we find Pope Alexander IV. enjoining him to prohibit the King of Scotland from seizing any part of the property of his church. Two years after, the pope writes to Henry III. of England, to engage him to use his utmost endeavours to gain the same object. In this letter his holiness complains of the evil counsellors who had beset the throne of the Scottish monarch, and, by perverting his tender mind, had led him to trample under foot the liberty and property of the Church, and to banish Gameline, not only from his bishopric but from his country. Yet Henry was so far from listening to the entreaties of the pope, that he determined to take part with his son-in-law, the King of Scotland; and, in 1258, issued an order, that the bishop should be seized and imprisoned, if he landed in any part of his dominions on his return from the court of Rome, to which, it would appear from this, he had gone. But it was not only against the bishopric of St Andrews that the hostility of Alexander and his courtiers was directed; the priory, too, came in for a share of their ill treatment, though on what account, or to what extent, we are not informed; for, in the above year, we find the pope giving authority to the Bishop of Dunkeld to inquire into a complaint made by the prior and canons, that certain noblemen, who are mentioned by name, had injured them in regard to their property; and to pronounce sentence according to the merits of the case, without leave of appeal, enforcing the same, if necessary, by ecclesiastical censures. Finally, in 1259, we once more find the pope calling on Bishop Gameline to prohibit Alexander III. from meddling with the property of the church of St Andrews.

There can be no doubt that, in the end, the church got the better of the king. The Chronicle of Melrose informs us, that the pope excommunicated Gameline's enemies, and ordered the sentence to be proclaimed throughout Scotland; and that this had the effect of bringing about a general reconciliation, and restoring things to their original state.

As a confirmation of this, we find our bishop engaged, in 1263, in baptizing the infant son of the king, as thus related by Wyntoun:—

> Syre Gamelyne,
> Byshop of Sanct Andrewys, syne
> Baptyzed that bairn; and Alexander
> Hym called, as was before his fadyr.[1]
> And when of that byrth cam tyding
> Til Alexander the thryd, our king,
> It was told hym that ilk day,
> That dead the king was of Norway.
> And so in double blytheness
> The kyngis heart at that tyme was.

This was Haco king of Norway, who had invaded Scotland, and was defeated at Largs.

It is singular enough that Wyntoun makes no mention of the aggression of Alexander and his court upon the property of the church of St Andrews, though he could scarcely fail to be aware of it. So far is he from doing so, that he speaks in the highest terms of the king's piety, and even his reverence for the Church and churchmen.

> He honoured God and haly kyrk,
> And meedful deeds he used to wyrk;
> Til all priestis he did reverens,
> And saved their statis with diligens.
> He was stedfast in Christen fay,
> Religious men he honoured ay.

[1] This young prince died at the age of twenty. It is remarkable, that though Alexander III. was killed at the early age of forty-five, he saw all his children die before him, and left only one grand-daughter, who also died in her childhood.

But the worthy Prior of Lochleven not only had an inherent veneration for royalty, but loved to act on the principle, "nil nisi bonum de mortuis." We shall see in the sequel, that he carried this so far as to speak favourably even of the Regent duke of Albany, brother of Robert III., whose character all historians have drawn in the darkest colours.

In 1267, a new dispute arose between the king and the bishop of St Andrews, which proved that the old enmity was not yet healed. One Sir John Dunmore had been excommunicated for some offence committed against the prior and canons. The king required Bishop Gameline to absolve him, even without any satisfaction rendered. This the bishop not only refused to do, but ratified the sentence, and excommunicated all the adherents of Dunmore, with the exception of the royal family. The king, in the irritation of the moment, ordered the bishop a second time into banishment; but, before he was able to obey, news came of the arrival in England of Cardinal Ottobon, a legate from Rome. Alexander, partly through apprehension of the legate's censure, it would seem, and partly from listening to moderate counsellors, who reminded him that it was his duty to uphold the just censures of the Church, recalled the sentence of banishment, and recommended Dunmore to submit; which he did, and obtained absolution, after making due satisfaction to the sufferers.[1]

Bishop Gameline is mentioned several times in the Register of the Priory, but chiefly in confirming previous grants and privileges to the priories of St Andrews and Lochleven, pp. 171-174, 178, 310. The last of these only need here be specified. It is a deed, dated 1266, wherein he appropriates the fruits of the

[1] Fordun, lib. x. cap. 22.

parish church of Forgan in Fife, and its chapel of Adnathan, to the building of the cathedral, after the decease of the then existing incumbent, Hugo de Striveling. He also binds the Prior and Canons of St Andrews to present a vicar to the said parish, who should serve in the same, and be answerable to him and his successors *de spiritualibus*.

Among the papal bulls preserved in the Advocates' Library, there is one from Pope Alexander IV. to the Bishop of Dunblane, empowering him to cause Gameline to be invested with the revenues of the rectory of Smalham, in virtue of his being the legal procurator of the same; and another from the same pope, addressed to himself, authorizing him to fill up vacancies in parish churches, in all cases within four months after the vacancies occurred.[1]

This bishop died of paralysis, at his palace of Inchmurtach, immediately after his return from the dedication of a church at Peebles, and was buried in his cathedral, at the north side of the high altar.

> A thousand twa hundyre seventy and ane
> Yearis, fra God had manhood tane,
> Of Sanct Andrewys, Syre Gamelyne,
> The byshop, died. And next hym syne
> Williame Wischard in hys stead
> Was byshop, when Gamelyne was dead.
> At Inchmurto this Gamelyne
> Died and was interred syne.
> At Sanct Andrewys his body lyes,
> His spyrit intil paradyse.

In the year of this bishop's death, there were no less than five Scottish bishoprics vacant, the rents of which the king applied to his own use, till they were filled up.[2] This was another instance of Alexander's sacrilege.

During the early part of this episcopate, Gilbert II.,

[1] Register, p. xliii. [2] Balfour's Annals, vol. i. p. 70.

who had been treasurer of the monastery, was made its prior on the death of John White. All that is recorded of him is, that he was a good man, and much commended for his skill in temporal affairs, but not very learned. He died in 1263. He is not mentioned by name in the Register; but in p. 346 there is a "memorandum," dated 1260, at which time he was prior, to the effect that one Falletauch appeared before the Justiciary Court of Perth, and gave up to the prior and canons all right which he had to the land of Drumkarach.

XXVIII. William Wishart, A.D. 1272–1279.

This prelate, who had been Archdeacon of St Andrews, Bishop elect of Glasgow, and Chancellor of the kingdom, owed his appointment to this see chiefly to the favour of Edward I. of England, and his interest with Pope Gregory X.; though the latter was displeased with him at first, because he had not gone to Rome in person to solicit his new dignity. A preceding pope, Urban IV., had enjoined that every bishop elect should go to Rome, in order to obtain confirmation—a practice which must have been attended with extreme inconvenience. At the period now under our review, there were four Scottish bishops elect waiting at Rome for confirmation, only two of whom ever obtained the object of their long and hazardous journey; for one of them died there, and another was rejected.[1] Nothing, indeed, seems more surprising than the constant intercourse which was kept up between Rome and the nations of Christendom during the middle ages, when the facilities for travelling must have been far less than they are at present. Even when we con-

[1] Spotswood, p. 46.

fine ourselves to the ecclesiastical state of Scotland, it would seem as if the pope could have had nothing else to do than to attend to its affairs, so incessant were the communications passing and repassing between him and every diocese, monastery, hospital, and college situated within it. And yet his attention must have been equally directed to the religious concerns, and often the political concerns also, of the other nations of Europe.

But whatever was the cause, Wishart's consecration was delayed for nearly two years after his election, and then the ceremony was performed at Scone, in the presence of the king, seven bishops, and many of the nobility; on which occasion he resigned the office of chancellor, which till then he had enjoyed. Fordun accuses him of being a pluralist, and ambitious. "It seemed strange to many," he says, "that a man of such high reputation, who was elect of Glasgow, Archdeacon of St Andrews, Chancellor of Scotland, as well as rector or prebendary of twenty-two churches, should be so ambitious, that all this did not suffice him; but that, swayed more by hypocrisy than religion, he should aspire to the bishopric of St Andrews also:"[1] and then he applies to him the following lines from Juvenal:—

> Non propter vitam faciunt patrimonia quidem,
> Sed, vitio cœci, propter patrimonium vivunt.
> Crescit amor nummi quantum ipsa pecunia crescit.

By command of Pope Gregory X., Wishart attended a general council of the Western Church at Lyons, in the year 1274, at which were present, two patriarchs, fifteen cardinals, five hundred bishops, and a thousand other mitred prelates; besides the Emperor of Germany, the King of France, and many inferior princes.

[1] Lib. x. c. 29.

One object of this council was to extinguish the Greek schism, which was effected, though the union of the Eastern and Western Churches was not of long continuance. The council also decreed the reduction of the mendicant orders of monks, which had become troublesome from their increasing numbers; the abolition of pluralities and non-residence among the clergy, and their exemption from civil imposts. The last of these decrees was carried into effect, because it was manifestly for the interest of the Church; but the two first ended in nothing. The mendicant orders were permitted to continue on their former footing, on paying a fine for this privilege; and dispensations for holding more benefices than one were allowed to be purchased by those clergymen who wanted them. From this it clearly appeared, that the object of the Council of Lyons was rather to fill the coffers of the pope, than to promote the reformation of the Church. The same council enacted, that every individual throughout Christendom should contribute one penny a-year, and every beneficed clergyman the tenth part of his income for six years, to defray the expense of the holy war. Next year, accordingly, a nuncio of the name of Bagimont, came into Scotland; and, in a council which he held at Perth, fixed the value of the Scottish benefices, and carried with him a tenth of their annual revenue to Rome. This valuation still exists, and is known by the name of "Bagimont's roll." The tenth of the revenue of the bishopric of St Andrews was estimated at £945, 13s. 4d. sterling. At this time a pound sterling was literally a *pound of silver*, which would equal £4 now. Consequently, £945 would equal £3780; and this sum, multiplied by ten, will give £37,800, the then revenue of the bishopric in modern money. This, it will be observed, harmonizes very nearly with what we have seen the

Register of the Priory made it amount to not many years before, p. 97.

Bishop Wishart founded and endowed the monastery of the Dominican friars, situated in South Street St Andrews, the north transept of whose chapel is still standing in front of the modern Madras school. The architecture is in the pointed style, which had recently been introduced into Scotland, and is much admired for its elegance. The Dominicans were a mendicant order, and were sometimes named *fratres predicatores*, or preaching friars, because their peculiar office was to preach against heresy. They were also called Black friars, from their wearing a black cross upon a white cloak. They were exempt from episcopal control, and were at liberty to confess, and give the sacraments to those who applied to them. What little property belonged to this branch of the order, was, at the Reformation, conveyed by Queen Mary to the provost and magistrates of the city.[1]

The last public act in which this bishop was engaged, was in endeavouring to settle the marches between England and Scotland, in conjunction with a certain number of men of rank belonging to both countries. They held their sittings at Berwick in 1278, but parted without coming to any satisfactory decision. The uncertainty of these marches was a source of endless debate and contention between the two kingdoms, and gave rise to continual skirmishes among the inhabitants on the borders.

Bishop Keith states, that Wishart "rebuilt, in a

[1] MS. Catalogue of Charters, p. 202. I have a cast of a seal belonging to the prior of the above monastery—a person praying to the Virgin and child, surrounded by the words, "S. Prioris fratrum predicatorum Scti. Andree." [James V., at the request of the Provincial of the order in Scotland, annexed the Dominican monasteries of Cupar and St Monance to that of St Andrews. The deed of annexation is dated at Edinburgh the 23d January, the 8th year of his reign.

stately manner, the east end of the cathedral, which had been thrown down by a tempest of wind." And Wyntoun thus describes certain other additions which he made to the same structure:—

Sevyn years and a half was he
Byshop, and gart biggyt be
Near[1] all the body of the kyrk.
Where that he began to wyrk,
Yet men may the tokenis see
Appearand by affinity,
Even above the thyrd pillere
Fra the chancel door seen there,
Bath under and above that south part,
And the north syde so westwart.
And that west gable alsua[2]
Intil hys time all gart he ma,[3]
And out of his ethchettis[4] hale
His kyrke he endyd cathedrale,
Bath in the stane, and roof, and tree.
The body of this kyrk thus he
In all things gart be biggyt weel,
That 'langyt[5] til it ilka deal.

The meaning seems to be this:—He was bishop seven years and a half, and, in the course of that time, caused nearly the whole body or nave of the church to be constructed in a uniform manner; beginning at the third pillar from the door of the choir, and then proceeding to the transepts, and the nave westward as far as the west gable. He thus finished the nave of the cathedral out of his own revenues, in stone, and lead, and timber, and furnished it with everything requisite.

I find no mention of Bishop Wishart in the Register of the Priory, except as a witness to two charters, without dates, pp. 279, 280. The first is, a grant of a piece of land by Patrick earl of Dunbar, "to God and the saints of the isle of May, and the monks there serving God." The second is, a grant of a cow yearly to the same monks from the same nobleman. I have no seal of this bishop.

[1] Almost. [2] Also. [3] Make.
[4] "Out of his whole property," I presume. [5] Belonged.

Wishart died at Marbottle in Teviotdale, and was buried in his own cathedral church, near the high altar. Wyntoun speaks of his death, and the succession of the next bishop, in the following terms:—

A thousand twa hundyr and seventy-nyne,
Fra lichter was the sweet Virgyne,
William Wyschart of Sanct Andrewys
Byshop, vertuous, and of gude thewys,[1]
Wyse, honest, and awenant,[2]
Til God and man in all plesant,
Died. And when that he was dead,
William Frazer intil hys stead
Succeedyt, and consecratyt was
Of the pope then called Nicholas,
Sevynteen winter than was he
Byshop of Sanct Andrewys see.

XXVIII. William Fraser, A.D. 1279–1297.

Fraser had been previously Lord Chancellor and Dean of Glasgow; and having been elected to this see, went to Rome, where he was both confirmed and consecrated by Pope Nicholas III. On his return, he resigned the office of Chancellor in favour of John Peebles archdeacon of St Andrews.

It may here be observed that the Culdees, who had, from time immemorial, voted at the election of the bishops of St Andrews, were excluded from the exercise of their right at the election of this bishop and his two predecessors; their power was at this time rapidly declining, and was destined soon to be annihilated.[3]

Wyntoun relates that Alexander III., the year before his death, came to St Andrews, and that, going up to the high altar of the cathedral church, he solemnly, and in the presence of many witnesses, "grawntyd til God and Syanct Andrewe the stryken of moné;" that is, he conferred on the Bishop of St Andrews and his

[1] Behaviour. [2] Courteous.
[3] Fordun, lib. vi. c. 44.

successors, the privilege of coining money; reserving to himself, however, the right of inspecting the purity of the metal.

The following are our chronicler's words:—

Alexander our kyng
That Scotland had in governyng,
Came intil hys ryauté,[1]
Til of Sanct Andrewys the city,
And in the kyrk standand there,
Devotly before the high altare,
In wytness of all that was by,
Gadryd and standand all freely,
Til God and Sanct Andrewe, he
Graunted the strycken of moné
As freely perfectly and fully,
As ony tyme before gane-by
Ony byshop had sic thyng,
When that before his fader was kyng,
Or of hys elders ony before
As mycht be heard, or had memore;
Saving the declaratioune
Of the inquisitioune
Of the feftment of that thyng,
To remain aye with the kyng.

Wyntoun seems here to suppose that the privilege of coining had formerly been conferred on the bishops of St Andrews; and Fordun says, still more expressly, "as fully and freely as any bishop of St Andrews ever before enjoyed this right, in the time of Alexander II. or any of his predecessors." But if it were so, we have no account of it, that I have ever met with. But it may be noticed, that in the reign of John Baliol, there was a small silver coin struck here, having on the obverse side a crowned head, with a cross before it, and the words "Johannes dei gra.;" and on the reverse, a cross-bar, containing four five-rayed stars, with the inscription "Civitas S. Andre."[2]

After the accident which deprived Scotland of Alexander III., in the year 1285, the regency of the king-

[1] The regality of St Andrews.
[2] Cardonnel's Numismata, where a copy of it may be seen.

dom was committed to six persons, of whom the Bishop of St Andrews was one.[1] Margaret, daughter of Eric king of Norway, and only surviving descendant of the late king, was declared heir to the crown. In 1289, we find Fraser, and two of his fellow-guardians, meeting with plenipotentiaries from the Kings of England and Norway, first at Salisbury, and the year following at Edinburgh, for the purpose of taking measures for the personal safety and education of the young princess, and her future marriage to Edward's eldest son. In these negotiations, Fraser is said to have favoured the views of Edward, and carried on a correspondence with him during their progress. But the death of the young lady the same year, put an end to all their schemes, and filled Scotland with dismay at the prospect of a disputed succession to the throne.

I will here give the letter which Bishop Fraser wrote to Edward on this occasion :—"To the most excellent Prince, Edward, by the grace of God, king of England, lord of Ireland, and duke of Aquitaine, William, his devoted chaplain, and the humble minister of St Andrews in Scotland, *salutem*, &c.—As was recently determined in your presence, the messengers sent by you, and some of the nobles of Scotland, met at Perth, on the Sunday before the feast of St Michael, to hear and consider your reply to the things which were submitted to you; which reply being heard, the faithful nobility, and a certain portion of the commonalty of Scotland, rendered great thanks to your highness. We then, and your messengers, determined to proceed to Orkney, in order to treat with the ambassadors from Norway, for the due reception of our lady the queen, when a

[1] Three north of the river Forth—Bishop Fraser, Duncan earl of Fife, and Alexander earl of Buchan; and three south of the Forth—the Bishop of Glasgow, John Cumyn earl of Badenoch, and James the steward of Scotland.

dismal rumour reached us that she was dead; a rumour that troubles and distracts the kingdom of Scotland. As soon as Robert de Bruce heard of this, he came to our meeting at Perth, which he did not intend doing before. He is accompanied by a great retinue; but what his object is, we have not yet learnt. The Earls of Mar and Athole have raised troops, and some of the other nobles are attaching themselves to his party: so that it may be feared there will be a civil war and great bloodshed, unless the Most High bring us a remedy through your means. The Bishop of Durham, the Earl of Warrene, and we, have just heard that our lady the Queen has recovered from her illness, but is still very infirm; on which account we have resolved to remain at Perth, or the neighbourhood, till we know certainly, from the knights who are gone to Orkney, the true state of our lady, which I heartily wish may be favourable. And should we receive such an account as we desire, (which we expect daily,) we will be prepared to proceed as we purposed, to the fulfilment of our design. If John de Baliol go to you, we advise you to treat with him in such a way as to maintain your own honour and advantage. But if it turn out that our lady is dead, (which God forbid!) let your Highness be pleased to come to our Border, to console our people, and hinder the effusion of blood; so that the faithful in our land may preserve their oath inviolate, and raise him to the throne who is entitled to it; yet, so that he may be willing to follow your counsel, (dum tamen ille vestro consilio voluerit adhærere.) May God crown you with temporal and eternal felicity! Given at Locres [Leuchars, near St Andrews] on the morrow of St Faith the virgin, ann. dom. 1290."

Bishop Fraser has been severely censured for this letter, as indicative of a readiness to sacrifice the independence of his country to a foreign prince. This

charge is not altogether just. It is well known that the King of England claimed a feudal supremacy over Scotland, and that many of the Scottish prelates and nobles acknowledged the claim. Bishop Fraser was evidently one of these. This, together with his natural desire for peace, will sufficiently account for the tenor of his letter, without subjecting him to the charge of treason.[1]

The Regents of Scotland now looked round for the nearest relation of the royal family, on whose head to place the crown of Scotland; and finding that John de Baliol and Robert de Bruce were the only competitors worthy of attention, they directed an inquiry into their respective claims. There can be no doubt that Baliol's pretensions, as great-grandson of the *eldest* daughter of David earl of Huntingdon, were, according to modern notions of primogeniture, preferable to those of his rival, who was the grandson of the *second* daughter. Bruce, on the other hand, alleged that, besides being a step nearer to their common ancestor, Alexander II., the great council of the nation had unanimously declared, in the memory of many then living, that he and his heirs were the lawful successors to the crown, failing issue of the king himself and his lineal descendants. The parties immediately concerned, however, could not agree; and there was therefore no alternative left but to appeal to Edward I., and submit to his arbitration.

It would be foreign to my purpose to enter into the details of the complicated process which ensued. Let it suffice to say, *first*, that Bruce, contrary to Buchanan's assertion, was the first of the two claimants to acknowledge Edward as the Lord Superior of Scotland; and

[1] See "Documents illustrating the early History of Scotland," edited by Sir Francis Palgrave; a volume which throws a great deal of new light on the interesting period now under our review.

that accordingly he, no less than Baliol, addressed him, during the pending controversy, "Come son Sovereyn Seigneur e son Empereur;" and, *secondly*, that after a long, and, it would appear, impartial investigation on the part of Edward, he assigned the crown to Baliol; but taking care to exact from him a renewed and formal acknowledgment of his own feudal supremacy. Baliol was then crowned at Scone, in the year 1292: Bruce being, at the time, far advanced in years; his son, Robert earl of Carrick, in the prime of life; and his grandson Robert, the *future king*, a youth of eighteen years old.

From this time, Edward I., in all his public documents, called himself "Rex et superior dominus Scotiæ;" or, as it is in the old French, which was much used at that time, "Suvereyn seygneur reame de Escoce." In addressing the public authorities in this country, he says, "vobis *mandamus* quod, &c.;" and he not only calls John Baliol his vassal, but seeks every opportunity of making him feel his degraded condition. At the same time, he carries on a frequent and familiar intercourse with Bishop Fraser, who *now* certainly seems to have acted with too much subserviency to his designs. The Rotuli Scotiæ afford numerous instances of this.[1] At different times, Edward orders a present of *stags* and *timber*, from the royal forests, to be sent to him; and similar gratuities to the other regents, as well as to numerous influential persons in Scotland, with a view, no doubt, to secure their approbation of his measures. But this humiliation, on the part of Scotland, was not destined to continue.

The last Bishop of St Andrews had purchased the Priory of the Isle of May from the Abbot and monks of Reading, in Yorkshire, with which they had been

[1] Vol. i. p. 1–19.

invested by David I., and annexed it to the Priory of St Andrews. The fact is unquestionable; for it rests not only on the testimony of Fordun, but on the still higher authority of the Rotuli Scotiæ. Yet there is no account of the transaction in the Register of the Priory, which is only another proof that that document, as we now possess it, is in an incomplete state.[1]

Upon a real or pretended complaint made to Edward, from the late superiors of the Priory of May, that its alienation was unwarranted, and that they had in vain sought redress at the hands of the King of Scotland, the former became, or affected to become, highly indignant; and immediately summoned his vassal to appear before him on a certain day, to answer for his conduct.[2] It is not probable that Baliol complied with this insolent demand, though he had with a similar one not long before; but if he did, it must have been with a very ill grace: for it is certain that, by this time, he had grown tired of his degraded condition, the greater part of his nobility were displeased with him on account of it, and he was only waiting for a favourable opportunity of asserting his independence.

Under these circumstances he sent the Abbot of Arbroath to announce formally to Edward his renunciation of the allegiance which he had sworn to him: having previously despatched the Bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld, Sir John Soules, and Sir Ingram de Umfraville as his ambassadors to France, to renew the ancient alliance with that country, and to solicit in marriage a French princess for his son. When Fraser sailed for France, he left his diocese under the charge of a procurator, and two chaplains, William

[1] See Preliminary Observations to Appendix VI.

[2] Prynne's Life of Edward I. See a translation of Edward's citation for Baliol to come to England, Appendix XXII. He had been summoned before, three different times, on pretences equally frivolous. —Rymer, vol. ii. pp. 606, 608.

Knigorne and Peter de Campaigne; but it would appear that he never returned home again, "since it is related of him," says Keith, "that he fell into a languishing distemper, and died at Carteville, in 1297. His body was interred in the Church of the Friars-Predicant, in Paris; but his heart, enclosed in a very rich box, was afterwards brought into Scotland by his immediate successor, Bishop Lamberton, and entombed in the wall of the Cathedral Church of St Andrews, near to the tomb of Bishop Gameline. He is said to have been a person of great worth, and would have performed many good works had he happened to live in peaceable times."

Intil France that ilk yeare
The Byshop Williame called Frasere
Of Sanct Andrewys died. He lyis
Intil the friars prechouris of Paris;
But his heart ordayned he
Broucht in Scotland for to be.
And so it was with honour,
And laid in hallowed sepulture
In Sanct Andrewys cathedrale
Kyrk the conventuale.
Chanonis togydir gadryd all
Laid that heart wythin the wall,
Where now are seen tombis twa,
Of Gamyl and Lambyrton are tha.
William Fraseris heart is laid
Betweene the tombis twa foresaid.

I have impressions of two seals belonging to this bishop. On the first is, the bishop holding his crosier, with the shield of his family at his feet, and the circumscription "S. Willi. Fraser, Dei gracia Scotorum epi." On the other is St Andrew on his cross, the family shield, and the bishop praying below, with the words "S. Willi. Fraser, epi. sci. Andree." This is the first instance of a Bishop of St Andrews assuming the title of his diocese upon his seal, though many of them had done so before as witnesses to charters.

The name of Bishop Fraser very seldom occurs in the Register of the Priory. In the year 1286, he desires the Dean of Lothian to institute Robert the chaplain of Haddington, into the vicarage of Linlithgow, p. 403. In pp. 16, 176, he becomes bound to pay to Peter de Campaigne a pension of £100 sterling. But the most remarkable is his grant of the church of Leuchars to the canons of the priory in the year 1294, "because they were afflicted by various disasters in those times, and got no relief from their insupportable burdens; and were even compelled, by the recent ruin of their affairs, to support their existence out of the bounty which kings and nobles had granted for the support of their church, whereby they had contracted debt, and had fallen into the hands of the money-lenders," p. 400.

During the whole of Bishop Fraser's time, John de Haddenton was prior of the monastery, having been made so *per electionem*. In addition to other laudable works, he built the great hall (magnam cameram) at the eastern part of the monastery, situated near the cemetery. After faithfully performing the office committed to him, during forty years, he died in 1304, and was buried in the chapter-house, under a stone with the following epitaph:—

> Corporis efficitur custos hæc petra Johannis,
> Quadriginta domûs prior hujus qui fuit annis
> Felix certamen certavit fide fideli
> Pace frui cœli concedat ei Deus. Amen.

He is spoken of in the Register as coming under engagements, first, to pay Bishop Fraser's bond to Peter de Campaigne, p. 176; secondly, to let to John de Fitkyll certain lands in Clackmannan for an annual rent, p. 398; thirdly, to pay Galfred de Berwick a stipulated sum for wine received from him, p. 405; and fourthly, as receiving permission from Gilbert de

Ballas to construct a mill-dam on the river Eden, at Dairsey, p. 339. He also obtains a bull from Nicholas IV., directing the Prior of Arbroath to settle a dispute which had arisen between him and his chapter on the one hand, and David, a burgess of Berwick, on the other, p. xliv. I have a cast of this prior's seal: St Andrew on his cross, with a sword on each side, the prior praying below, and the words " S. iohis. p. oris. eccle. sci Andree ī. Scocia."

Before Fraser's death, Baliol, as we have seen, had come to an open rupture with Edward, and renounced his allegiance to that monarch. Edward, extremely offended at this affront, transferred his favour to Bruce, promised him the crown of Scotland on the same terms that it had been held by Baliol, and, aided by his followers, gave battle to the Scotch at Berwick and Dunbar, whom he defeated. Baliol soon after sent in his submission to the conqueror; and in the castle of Brechin, in the most humiliating terms, confessed that, misled by evil counsellors, he had justly offended his liege lord the King of England, and entreated forgiveness. The latter immediately despatched the captive king and his son to London, in the Tower of which he kept them prisoners for three years. But he did not keep his promise to Bruce, who was obliged to dissemble his resentment for the present, in hopes of more favourable times.[1]

[1] When John Baliol refused to obey Edward's summons to appear before him, the latter exclaimed,—

Ah! ce fol felun, tel foly fettes!
S'il ne voit venir a nos, nos vendrum a ly.

Thus translated by Wyntoun,—

Now may yhe se that a fwle swne
Here a fwlis deid ha dwne!
Cwm til ws gyve he na wille;
But dowt, we sall cum hym til.

Or in modern English,—

Meanwhile Edward overran and possessed himself of a great part of Scotland. Among other places which he visited, he passed Saturday, the 11th of August, 1296, at St Andrews. The fact is thus briefly noticed in a "Diary of the Expedition of Edward I. into Scotland"[1]:—"The Thursday [he went] to the Abey of Londor, and taryed there the ffryday, saynt Lawrens day. Saturday, to the citie of Seynt Andrew, a castell and a good toune. The Sonday, to Merkynche, &c." At Berwick he held a Parliament, where he received the homage of all the principal men of the kingdom.

Meanwhile Sir William Wallace was bestirring himself to throw off the English yoke, and assert the independence of his country. It would appear that many English ecclesiastics had at this time got possession of Scottish benefices, and were in secret concert with their king to promote his views upon the permanent sovereignty of Scotland. These, Wallace made it his first business to drive out of the country.

If we may believe the English historians, who always speak of Wallace and his adherents as no better than robbers, this was done under circumstances

> What a foolish thing is this the fool has done!
> If he 'll not come, we 'll go to him right soon.

Again, when Bruce asked Edward, after the battle of Dunbar, to fulfil his promise of giving him the crown of Scotland, the latter scornfully replied,—

> Ne avons ren autres chos a feris
> Que a vogis reangs ganere?

Which Wyntoun thus renders,—

> Haive I nocht ellys to do nowe
> Bot wyn a kynrick to gyve yhowe?

Or,—

> Have I nothing else to do
> Than to win a crown for you?

I quote these examples chiefly for the purpose of giving the reader some idea of the remarkable changes which both the French and English languages have undergone since the fourteenth century.

[1] Printed in the Bannatyne Miscellany, vol. i. p. 280.

of extreme barbarity. "That most perfidious nation, the Scotch," says Knighton, lib. iii., "murdered as many of the English as they could find, violently dragging the religious men from the monasteries to which they belonged. They even made a mockery of their sufferings; for they led the aged English monks and nuns, whom they had reserved for this purpose, to the bridges which crossed their rivers, and, after tying their hands and feet, that they might not escape by swimming, they precipitated them into the stream below, while they feasted their eyes with the spectacle of the unhappy wretches struggling for their existence. Among these were two canons of St Andrews in Scotland, who, while they were standing on the bridge of St Johnston, in the presence of that robber William Wallace, expecting instantly to be thrown over, were thus saved as if by miracle. Some messengers happened to arrive at the moment to speak to him. This called off his attention from the canons, who, in the meantime, were sent to prison. In the end, owing to a change of affairs, they were ransomed by their English brethren, and liberated, on promising never to return to Scotland again. One of them lived at Gisborne, and told the above story with his own mouth. I insert it, together with the following one, to show the spiteful malice which the abominable Scotch entertain towards the English, above all other nations. There were three Englishmen living at St Andrews; and, in order that they might escape from the fury of Wallace, when he came there, they took refuge on a certain stone which is called the rock or needle of St Andrews, (in lapidum illum qui dicitur petra vel acus Sancti Andree,) thinking that the privilege of the sacred stone would afford them that protection which was now denied to holy mother church. They were nevertheless pursued thither by the Scotch, and cruelly

murdered on the spot." What stone or rock this could have been, it is impossible to say, unless it were the rock near the mouth of the harbour called the "Lady Craig," (see p. 26;) but we may be allowed to hope, for the honour of our country and one of its greatest heroes, that, as this part of the narrative seems to possess a questionable character, so the obvious prejudice of the historian had betrayed him into the belief of stories which rested on no good foundation. The times, however, were undoubtedly very barbarous.

After the battle of Irnside, which was gained by Wallace in June 1298, his followers are made, by "Blind Harry," his biographer, to proceed to St Andrews, and turn out the bishop.

> Upon the morn to Sanct Androwis they past,
> Out of the toun that byschop turned fast.
> The Kyng of Ingland had him hidder send,
> The rent at will he gave him in commend.
> His kyngis charge as then he durst nocht hald;
> A wrangwys pope that tyrand micht be cald.
> Few fled with him, and gat away by sea;
> For all Scotland he wald nocht Wallace see.
> As then of him he made but licht record,
> Gart restore him that there was richtwys lord. [1]

When I first met with this idea of turning the bishop out of his see, I considered it to be a mere flight of the poet's imagination in order to exalt the achievements of his hero; because Fraser had been dead more than twelve months, and Lamberton, his successor, being abroad, had not yet taken his place. But I am now disposed to think that he has told nothing but the truth. It will appear under the next episcopate, that William Cumyn, brother of the Earl of Buchan and Culdean Provost of Kirkheugh, had been nominated bishop after Fraser's death, by his

[1] Dr Jamieson's edition, p. 256.

brethren of the conventual chapter, and probably, therefore, had temporary possession of the see when Wallace came to the city. He is not reckoned among the Bishops of St Andrews, because he had no formal admission, and because he could have held his situation only for a few months. But being a Cumyn, and of the opposite faction to Bruce and Wallace, he would naturally be supported by Edward's interest. And, as a corroboration of this, we find that, a few years after, Edward wrote to the pope, requesting Cumyn to be confirmed in the see; and also that Lamberton caused the rents of his provostry of Kirkheugh and its church of Ceres to be sequestrated till he had given in his adherence to Bruce.[1] The bishop himself had by that time broken faith with Edward, and he was desirous that his former rival should do the same. This, then, being Cumyn's position in 1298, we need not wonder if he were unwilling to encounter Wallace, and was glad to "get away by sea" at his approach.

But the battle of Falkirk once more turned the scale against Fife and St Andrews. The particulars of the injury done to the town and neighbourhood by Edward are not recorded; but Hardynge has stated the fact in the two following expressive lines, with which I will conclude this episcopate.

> And into Fiffes he went, and *brent it clene*,
> And Andrewe's toune he *wasted then full plane*.

On this occasion, no doubt, the castle was taken and garrisoned by English troops.

XXIX. William de Lamberton, A.D. 1298–1328.

> When Williame Fraser thus was dead,
> Then chosen byshop in hys stead
> Was Master Williame of Lambertoun,
> A lord commendyt of renoun,

[1] Documents and Records, by Sir F. Palgrave, p. 327.

A clerk of gret fame and vertue,
Chauncelar he was then of Glasgow.

Wyntoun passes over the contest which, we learn from other sources, occurred between the Culdees and the Augustinian canons at the election of Lamberton. The ancient Culdean chapter of the cathedral had always claimed, and often exercised the right of electing the Bishops of St Andrews, though, latterly, not without some opposition and interruption. On this occasion, they determined to make one more effort for the recovery of their expiring power. They elected, for their bishop, William Cumyn, brother of the Earl of Buchan, and provost of their own monastery at St Andrews. The canons-regular, on their side, chose William de Lamberton. The latter was indebted for his nomination partly to his friend Sir William Wallace, whose influence in Scotland, at that juncture, was almost unbounded. But, as the pope was the grand umpire in all ecclesiastical disputes, and as neither party could take possession of the see without his bulls, reference was had to him. Accordingly, Cumyn went to Rome in person, and advocated his own cause, but without success. His holiness listened to his arguments; but, not unwilling, perhaps, to abridge a power which interfered in some degree with his own, he gave a decision against the claims of the Culdees, on the somewhat frivolous plea that they had suffered their alleged rights to be invaded on former occasions without appealing to him. This decision seems to have been fatal to their existence as an independent body, as, after that period, scarcely any mention is made of them in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. Their monastery of Kirkheugh, at St Andrews, consisting of a provost and twelve prebendaries, continued till the Reformation; but the *congè d'elire* was transferred to the Augustinian canons, though, in fact, the actual

appointment to the see depended principally, if not entirely, on the pope.

Bishop Lamberton succeeded to his dignity in trying and turbulent times, and often, as we shall see, vacillated between the contending parties of Baliol (or rather of the King of England) and Bruce, with less regard to the promises which he made alternately to each, than to what seemed to him best adapted to serve his own ends, or the interests of his church and nation. This, indeed, was the prevailing vice of those unhappy times. The most solemn obligations were entered into, only to be violated whenever a favourable opportunity presented itself. Wallace, though denounced as a robber by the English, was the only Scotsman of rank who had not committed this offence, and who was uniform in his opposition to the claims of Edward I.

It would appear that Lamberton passed the first years of his episcopate in France; for we find Edward afterwards accusing him of writing from thence in order to encourage Wallace to prosecute the war against him, and even granting, for this purpose, an allowance out of his episcopal revenues.[1] But when Wallace resigned the government of Scotland in 1299, the bishop, John Cumyn younger of Badenoch, and Bruce earl of Carrick, (whose father was now dead,) were nominated in his room. They followed up the war with England, but, for a considerable time, with no decisive result. During that period, two truces were negotiated between the kingdoms, in both of which we find our bishop taking a part. In the course of the same period, the Scots petitioned Boniface VIII. to request the justice or the clemency of Edward in their favour. His holiness interposed according-

[1] Documents and Records, p. clxii—clxxii.

ly; but carried his pretensions so high, that he claimed the whole kingdom of Scotland as an ancient dependency of the Roman see, and the exclusive patrimony of St Peter! This gave rise to a curious correspondence between him and the King of England, as to their respective claims on the sovereignty of this country. The pope, with a view to strengthen his own claim, goes over, in his letter, a great part of the history of Scotland, and labours to prove that she had never yielded any subjection to the crown of England. Edward, in his reply, contends for the contrary; and, being now free from foreign wars, he prepared to assert his rights by more powerful means than arguments. Accordingly, in the year 1303, he marched a large army into the Scottish dominions, which he speedily overran and effectually secured. He passed the winter at Dunfermline, the spacious monastic buildings of which his soldiers destroyed. In the Lent of the following year, he held a parliament of both nations in St Andrews, where all the chief nobility and church dignitaries of Scotland renewed their allegiance to the conqueror, except only Sir W. Wallace, Sir W. Oliphant, and Sir Simon Fraser, who were in consequence outlawed, and soon after either taken or perished.

> And at Sanct Andrewys then bade he,
> And held hys Lentyne in reawty.[1]
> And there he held hys Parliament;
> For he had in hale intent
> That the kynrick of Scotland
> Suld all tyme be wyth hym durand,
> As he had then possessioune
> Til hym and hys successioune.

We have no farther account of what the King of England did in this city, except that he stript the leaden roof off the refectory of the priory, to face the battering machines which he intended for the siege of

[1] *i. e.* Held his Lent in the regality of St Andrews.

Stirling; a town which at that time held out against him, but which he soon after took.[1] Before he left Scotland, he changed its laws and constitution, and destroyed numerous libraries and charters; and when he returned home, he carried with him the ancient records of the nation, and the celebrated marble chair of Scone, in the fate of which that of the kingdom itself was supposed to be involved.

In 1304, the Earl of Carrick died; and his son, the future king, succeeded to his rank and honours. Notwithstanding the oath of fidelity which both he and Cumyn had recently taken to Edward, they entered into a conspiracy against him. Bruce, at the same time, made a secret treaty with the Bishop of St Andrews, by which they mutually pledged themselves to assist and defend each other against their common enemies, "under the penalty of ten thousand pounds, to be applied in prosecuting the war against the infidels in the Holy Land."[2] Whether Cumyn was a party to this treaty, does not appear; but that nobleman, either through jealousy of Bruce, or in the hope of supplanting him, betrayed his colleague to Edward; on which account, as soon as Bruce had ascertained the fact, and was able to leave the English court, where he was residing at the time, he hurried to Dumfries, where Cumyn was, and stabbed him to death in the Franciscan monastery of that town. Within eight days after, he received absolution for this crime from Wishart bishop of Glasgow.

When intelligence of this reached Rome, the pope instantly fulminated a bull against the culprit, branding him with the guilt of murder and sacrilege, and directing two English prelates to pronounce sentence of

[1] Fordun, lib. xii. cap. 3; ad machinas construendas. Boethius says it was copper.

[2] See a copy of this treaty, Appendix XXIII.

excommunication against him and all his adherents. But the tidings of the murder produced a very different effect on the Bishop of St Andrews. When he heard of it, he made use of these words, as recorded by Barbour:—[1]

> I hope Sir Thomas hys prophecy
> Of Ersiltoun, verified be
> In hym; for so, our Lord help me,
> I have great hopes he shall be kyng,
> And have this land all in leadyng.

With this hope, the bishop, when asked by his friend Bruce to crown him king of Scotland, needed but few arguments to persuade him to comply, notwithstanding the immense risk he ran of suffering from the vengeance of the King of England.

But while preparations were making for this solemnity, it will be necessary to introduce here the celebrated Sir James Douglas, son of Sir William Douglas, the companion in arms of the unfortunate Wallace. Sir William had recently died in an English prison, his great estates had been seized by King Edward, and given to Lord Clifford, while his son and heir, Sir James, had been forced to take refuge in France. A few years before this, he had ventured to return home, and was now living in concealment under the protection of Bishop Lamberton, in the castle of St Andrews. When Edward was in Scotland, in 1303, the bishop had tried to interest him in the young knight's favour, and to recover his forfeited estates; and with this view, he introduced him to the king at Stirling. But, as soon as Edward learnt who he was, he reproached the bishop for his presumption in making such a request, adding, "his father was always my

[1] Barbour was Archdeacon of Aberdeen, and wrote his History of Bruce about the year 1375. Thomas the Rhymer of Ercildoune had, it seems, foretold that Bruce would one day be King of Scotland.

enemy; and I have already bestowed his lands upon more loyal followers than the son will ever prove." When, therefore, young Douglas heard that Bruce was about to declare himself king, he felt his spirit stir within him; and seeking his patron the bishop, privately informed him of his intention to join his fate to that of his rightful sovereign. "Father," said he, "thou hast heard how these English have spoiled me of my paternal property; thou hast heard, too, that the Earl of Carrick has openly asserted his claim to the throne, while these strangers are leagued against him, and have determined to avenge the slaughter of Cumyn, and to disinherit him, as they have done me. I am therefore resolved, with your good leave, to join my fortune to Bruce, and share with him both weal and woe; nor do I despair, through his help, to regain my lands, in spite of Clifford and all his kin."—"Grateful should I be, my dear son," replied Lamberton, "that thou wert there; and yet, were I now to give thee openly the means of joining him, it would work our ruin. Go then secretly and take from my stable my own palfrey. Should the groom make any resistance, spare not a blow to quell it. This will exculpate me, and then mayest thou obey thy will."[1] The bishop was obliged to act with extreme caution on this occasion; for, though he had the strongest assurance of Bruce's success, and was about to give the most undoubted proof of it, yet his castle of St Andrews was, at this time, in the hands of the English, who, on the least suspicion of a conspiracy, would instantly have imprisoned all concerned in it. His young friend, however, too happy to get the bishop's sanction for engaging in the enterprise on which he had set his mind, went that very night and took his

[1] Barbour's Bruce, pp. 26, 27.

palfrey from the stable, felling the groom with his sword, who attempted to hinder him; and, mounting in haste, rode to meet Bruce, who was by this time on his way to Scone. As soon as they met, the youthful knight threw himself from his horse, and kneeling, as he held Bruce's bridle-rein, proffered him his homage and his service. The Earl of Carrick, raising him up and fondly embracing him, received him into his service, and, turning to his lords who crowded around them, expressed his confidence that he would prove himself worthy of his brave lineage; an anticipation which was afterwards more than realized. The cavalcade now resumed its progress to Scone, where they were soon joined by the Bishops of St Andrews, Glasgow, and Moray, who, with the assembled nobles, prepared to crown their prince with as much ceremony as their depressed circumstances would admit. Edward had carried off, not only the stone on which every King of Scotland had sat at his coronation since the days of Kenneth M'Alpine, but the crown itself, and the regal mantle which had been worn on the occasion. But the wooden chair still remained; and a slight coronet of gold was hastily made to supply the place of the crown. When these simple preparations were completed, the Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow crowned Bruce King of Scotland, on the 27th March 1306. The next day, an incident occurred which ought not to be omitted. The Earls of Fife, ever since the days of Malcolm Caenmore, had exercised the right of placing the king in the inaugural chair of Scone, in memory of the high services rendered to that monarch by their ancestor Macduff. On this occasion, the Earl could not attend, being a prisoner in England; but his sister, Isabella countess of Buchan, unexpectedly made her appearance at Scone, and insisted on exercising the family right as her brother's repre-

sentative. This claim it was deemed expedient to comply with, and the king was accordingly installed a second time by the hands of the Countess. But the spirited lady suffered severely for her patriotism a few months after, when Bruce was defeated at Methven. She there fell into the hands of Edward, who caused a cage to be constructed for her in one of the turrets of Berwick castle. In this she was shut up for four long years, with no one to speak to, except an Englishwoman who supplied her with food. She was then relieved in part, by being transferred to the Carmelite monastery of the same place.

The Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow, and the Abbot of Scone, also suffered severely, on the same occasion, for their infidelity to Edward and violation of their oaths. Where Lamberton and the abbot were seized, does not appear; but the Bishop of Glasgow was taken prisoner in the castle of Cupar, when assisting to defend it from Sir Almyr de Valence. The following order, addressed to the English authorities, in regard to these prelates, will show the treatment to which they were subjected.[1]

"Order that the Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow, and the Abbot of Scone, be delivered by the Sheriff of Northumberland to William de Rithre and his men, together with ten horsemen and forty footmen of the Earl of Northumberland's. These shall take over the said bishops and abbot, granting a receipt, to which the said William and the horsemen shall set their seals, and be answerable for their prisoners, body for body.

"They shall then conduct them safely from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, to the castle of Nottingham; to the constable of which they shall be delivered, and guarded, each by himself, till the Bishop of Chester arrive, who

[1] Rymer, vol. ii. 1015.

shall order them to be disposed of as the king may direct. The said William and his clerk shall accompany the said bishops and abbot, to see that they are all well guarded, by night and by day, and shall remain with them in the castle of Nottingham till the Bishop of Chester come.

"The said William is to have open letters from the Privy Seal, directed to the sheriffs and other servants of the king, to assist in the transport of the prisoners, as they shall be ordered. He shall also have letters to the constables of the castles, that they may receive the prisoners into their charge, and so guard them that no one shall go in or out to them, by day or night, except their keepers.

"On Thursday, the morrow of St Lawrence, the prisoners shall be removed from Newcastle-upon-Tyne to the castle of Durham. On Friday, from Durham to Northallerton. On Saturday, from Northallerton to Knaresborough castle. On Sunday, from Knaresborough to Pontefract castle. On Monday, from Pontefract to Tykehull castle. On Tuesday, from Tykehull to Newark castle. On Wednesday, from Newark to Nottingham castle.

"Memorandum—That the Sheriff of Southampton, to whom the Bishop of St Andrews, the betrayer of the king, shall be delivered, shall imprison him in the tower of Winchester castle, and shall defray his expenses as follows:—

For the bishop himself,	.	6 denarii daily.[1]	
For an attendant,	. .	3	do. do.
For a serving boy,	. .	1½	do. do.
For a chaplain to say mass,		1½	do. do.

[1] According to Bishop Fleetwood, the shilling of the year 1300 would buy fifteen times as much of the necessaries of life as it would in 1700, when he wrote. Bishop Lamberton's daily allowance, therefore, being twelve denarii, or one shilling, was equal to fifteen shillings of modern money.

which chaplain, attendant, and boy, shall be of known probity, and for whose fidelity the sheriff shall be answerable.

"Also, the same sheriff to whom the Bishop of Glasgow shall be delivered, shall imprison him in the castle of Porchester, and allow him the same attendance and daily expenses as the Bishop of St Andrews; which expenses, together with any other he may in reason incur, shall be paid him out of the Exchequer, in virtue of this document, a copy of which shall be held by the treasurer."

These churchmen would, no doubt, have been put to death, as were many of the Scottish nobles at that time who fell into the hands of the vindictive Edward, had it not been for their sacred office and their high ecclesiastical rank.

But besides imprisoning these prelates, Edward wrote a letter to Pope Clement V., giving a detail of the number and aggravations of their offences. The charge against Bishop Lamberton may be thus abridged: That, when Chancellor of Glasgow, in 1296, he had done fealty to Edward as his rightful king, upon the consecrated host, upon the Gospels, the cross Neyth, and the black rood of Scotland; that, nevertheless, he had taken part with William Wallace, and, with his aid, got himself elected Bishop of St Andrews, and used every effort to support him against England; that, when Edward regained the ascendancy in 1303–4, Lamberton came forward and tendered him his services and oath, which were accepted, and that he then received back the revenues of his see, which had been sequestrated; that, after all this, when Cumyn was killed by Bruce, Lamberton joined the latter, crowned him at Scone, and gave up to him a valuable hostage, which Edward had entrusted to his custody: that, again, he submitted to Sir Almyr de Valence when he

saw the English power increasing; but that, once more, having got leave to return to St Andrews, he rejoined Bruce, and assisted him with men and money at the battle of Methven. The letter then dwells upon the heinousness of the crime of perjury, of which this prelate of holy church had been repeatedly guilty; and declares that, though the king is most anxious for the recovery of the Holy Land, he cannot undertake this distant expedition unless the Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow are restrained, who are the main supporters of his enemies. Finally, Edward requests that Lamberton might, on account of his misconduct, be removed from his see, and that William Cumyn, who had been duly elected to it in the first instance, might be preferred in his place.[1]

Whether the foregoing letter was ever forwarded to the pope, or what answer it received, does not appear; but certainly its prayer was not complied with.

Edward I. died in 1307; and in May 1308, we find Edward II., his successor, ordering one of the Guardians of Scotland to pay the revenues of St Andrews into his exchequer, but to allow the bishop £100 per annum out of them for his maintenance.[2] In August following, he is released, and his revenues fully restored to him, after taking the following oath:—"To all who may see these letters, William, by Divine mercy, bishop of St Andrews, *salutem*. Know that we, awaiting the royal clemency which the most illustrious king our lord has vouchsafed to extend to us, hereby promise that, from this time, we will be faithful to the said king, whom we acknowledge as our liege lord. We will keep faith with him and his heirs; and will, as far

[1] This makes it extremely probable that Cumyn was the pretender to the see, who, according to Blind Harry, had been supported by Edward, and thrust out by Wallace. P. 140.

[2] Rymer, vol. iii. p. 81.

as possible, bring back his enemies to their allegiance; promising that we will allay, by every means in our power, and by ecclesiastical censures, if necessary, all conventions and conspiracies against the peace of Scotland which shall be made known to us; and that we will reveal the same without delay to the king or his servants. We will also advance the state of our lord the king in all things; nor will we do anything, or permit anything to be done, whereby cause of discord may arise between the said king and the people of England or Scotland. To all and each of which things we, of our own free accord, bind ourselves, and take our corporal oath upon the consecrated body of our Lord, and upon the cross GNAYTH.[1] Besides, we promise, upon the faith of the same oath, that we will not go beyond the limits of the diocese of Durham, to which, for greater security, our lord the king has restricted us, without his special permission. In testimony of which, we have affixed our seal to these presents. At Northampton, 11th August, 1308."[2]

Edward, writing to the pope soon after, says, "The Bishop of St Andrews has been well advised to make his submission in the most ample manner, and I no longer apprehend any bad offices from him. I even

[1] This was reputed to be a piece of the true Cross, and was named Gnayth, Neth, or Neet, because brought by a monk of some such name from the Holy Land. It was carefully preserved at Windsor, except when carried in procession on solemn occasions. It is stated in Rymer, vol. ii. p. 867, that the Bishop of Glasgow swore fealty to Edward II. "sur le cors de nostre Seignor, et la cros de Neyt, et la blake rode d'Escosse."

[2] At the earnest request of the pope, Edward subsequently released the Bishop of Glasgow; but not without telling his holiness that he deserved a different fate, on account of his manifold rebellions and perjuries. He accused him, in particular, of being more a soldier than a peaceful prelate,—"who had exchanged the rochet for a shield, the stole for a sword, the alb for a mail shirt, the mitre for a helmet, and the crosier for a lance."—Rymer, vol. iii. p. 121.

expect much aid from his exhortations to the Scots, who have great reliance on him."

Notwithstanding all this, in one year after, we find Lamberton presiding at an assembly of his clergy in Dundee, in which the right of Bruce to the throne of Scotland is asserted in the strongest terms.[1] Yet, in 1311, Edward again writes to the pope, entreating him not to insist on the attendance of the Bishop of St Andrews at the general council of Vienne, to which he had been summoned; assigning as a reason, that the residence of that prelate in Scotland was necessary to the support of his interests. "We have committed to him chiefly," he says, "the care of the Scottish nation; because we hope that, by his exhortations, he will satisfy the people, and further the public peace and tranquillity." And soon after, he addresses him again to the same effect; and writes, besides, to three different cardinals, to use their influence with the pope to excuse the bishop's attendance at Vienne.[2] We can only conclude from all this, that Lamberton had succeeded hitherto in keeping his support of Bruce a secret from Edward.

But the battle of Bannockburn, in 1314, gave a new turn to the affairs of Scotland. There can be no doubt that Lamberton rejoiced at the issue of this event, so glorious for his country, and so honourable to his friend Bruce, if he did not contribute to bring it about. Yet it is remarkable, that, within a few months after the battle, we find the King of England granting him a safe conduct, for one year, to proceed (through England probably) to foreign parts, "ad partes transmarinas," though to what country, or with what object, is not stated;[3] but it is not improbable it was with a

[1] Dalrymple's Annals, vol. iii. p. 249.
[2] Rymer, vol. iii. pp. 308, 309, 323.
[3] Ibid. vol. iii. p. 496.

view to make an expiation, at some foreign shrine, for his repeated violation of his oaths.

It would appear that, immediately after his return from this excursion, he devoted himself to the interests of his church and diocese, which could not be in a very flourishing state, while a civil war had been for so many years raging in the very bosom of the country. He repaired the castle of St Andrews, and made several additions to the priory. He constructed the new chapter-house at his own expense, "adorning it," says Martine, "with curious seats and ceilings." Some of these "seats" are yet to be seen, but the only remaining "ceiling" is the open sky. To the canons he gave various utensils for the better celebration of their worship, and supplied their library with a number of books. He also built places of residence for himself and his successors, which Fordun calls "fortilizata maneria, at Inchmurtach, Monimail, Dairsey, Tory, Mukard, Monymusk, Linton, Ketens, Lasswade, and Le Stow in Wedal." Besides this, he erected ten new churches in his diocese, and performed many other useful works. But his most magnificent work was the completion and dedication of the cathedral church of St Andrews. This had been going on under eleven successive bishops, namely, from the time of Arnold, who founded it, down to the present bishop, who finished it. It thus occupied in building, a period of one hundred and fifty-eight years; "and considering," says Martine, "the time it was demolisht [1559], it stood entire two hundred and forty years; and from the foundation to the razing thereof (occasioned by a sermon of John Knox against indolatrie, preached to a giddy lawless multitude) was just four hundred years."

But before proceeding to the particulars of the dedication of the cathedral, it is necessary to state

here, that Edward III. had by this time discovered Bishop Lamberton's infidelity to his engagement. This will most clearly appear from the following letter which he addressed to Pope John XXII., dated London, 1st June, 1318:—"The king devoutly kisses the pope's feet. Seeing that William de Lamberton bishop of St Andrews, in Scotland, inflamed with satanic fury, became the wicked invader of the peace of Edward our father, of illustrious memory, as well as of the whole English nation, to the great injury thereof, and the reproach of his own holy calling,—when he was taken prisoner, he was condemned, and shut up in our castle of Winchester. Whereupon, our most holy father, Clement V., of good memory, anxious for the welfare of England, and unwilling that the see of St Andrews should remain destitute of pastoral superintendence, bestowed the vacant prelacy upon Thomas de Rivers of the order of the Minorites, a man of royal extraction, and commended for his piety, learning, and abilities; confirming the appointment by a bull which may, no doubt, yet be seen at the Court of Rome, and which was duly proclaimed in England. But, after the death of our said father the king, we, moved with compassion, restored the said Bishop Lamberton to his liberty, notwithstanding the papal collation already mentioned; he swearing on the holy Evangelists, that he would do nothing, or allow anything to be done, as far as depended upon him, whereby the peace of our kingdom might be interrupted. Yet this same bishop, unmindful of the favours conferred upon him, was not satisfied with being himself abandoned, but heaped on us injury upon injury, and attached himself with all his might to Robert de Bruce, the wicked betrayer and invader of our kingdom, in violation of his solemn oath, and to our great loss and detriment. We, therefore, earnestly implore

your holiness that you would be pleased, instantly and effectually, to cause the said Bishop Lamberton to be deposed, and the said Thomas de Rivers, our dear friend and brother, to be collated in his room; whereby you will greatly promote the peace of our kingdom. May the Most High vouchsafe to preserve your reverend holiness for the good of the church, and the salvation of the faithful."

To the above letter the pope made this very dignified and sensible reply:—"Johannes episcopus, servus, &c., to our dearly-beloved, &c., salutem, &c.—You have intimated to us, dearest son, that William de Lamberton bishop of St Andrews, in Scotland, having been condemned to imprisonment in England, Clement V., our predecessor of happy memory, for the peace of your kingdom, granted the said bishopric to Thomas de Rivers, of the order of the Minorites, the confirmation of which grant, you say, was deposited in our court; and that the said William, after being again liberated, had sworn that he would no longer molest the tranquillity of your kingdom; but that, nevertheless, he had since attached himself to Robert de Bruce, and become your enemy; on which account you implore us to depose the said William, and collate the said Thomas. Truly, dearest son, we never before heard that our predecessor had conferred the said bishopric of St Andrews on Thomas de Rivers, nor have we been able to discover any letters to this effect in our court; nor could there have been any such letters, until the said William had been tried by a lawful process, and sentence pronounced against him; of which process and sentence we find no record. Though, therefore, we are most favourably disposed to you and your kingdom, and ready to prosecute all who may injure you, yet we cannot depose a bishop whose crimes have never been officially reported to us. Neither can

we restore a bishopric to Thomas de Rivers, which it does not appear he ever had, or could have had. But if you possess any process, or apostolical letters, by which your petition can be sustained, delay not to send them to us; and you shall see that, when the premises have been duly substantiated, not only a lawful prosecution, but a speedy execution, shall follow thereupon. Given at Avignon, 15th Kal., October, third year of our pontificate."

Bishop Lamberton, in the meantime, not knowing anything about, or not regarding, the correspondence which was passing between the pope and the King of England concerning himself, was making preparations for the consecration of his cathedral church. On the 5th July, 1318, this interesting solemnity was performed in the presence of King Robert I., seven bishops, fifteen abbots, and most of the knights and barons of the kingdom, all of whom presented gifts and offerings on the occasion.

A thousand thrce hundyre and aughteen
Fra Chryst had borne the mayden clean
Of the moneth of July
The fyft day, full solemnly
The Bishop Williame of Lambertoune
Made the dedicatioune
Of the new kyrk cathedrale
Of Sanct Andrewys conventuale.
The Kyng Robert honourably
Was there in persoun bodyly;
And syven byshopis were seen
And abbotis also were there fyfteen,
And mony other gret gentilmen
Were gadryd to that assembly then.

Bruce was, at this very time, under a papal sentence of excommunication; and it is a proof how little our bishops were under Roman influence, when they, nevertheless, admitted Bruce to assist at this religious solemnity. He did not finally make his peace with the pope till the last year of his life, which was evinced

by his holiness issuing a bull, empowering the Bishop of St Andrews, (or, failing him, the Bishop of Glasgow,) to crown and anoint him, and his successors, as Kings of Scotland.[1]

The king endowed the cathedral, on the occasion of its dedication, with one hundred marks sterling annually from his private revenues, out of gratitude, it is said, "for the illustrious victory which St Andrew, the patron saint of his kingdom, had recently afforded him at Bannockburn." But this grant he subsequently redeemed, by substituting for it the church of Fordun in the Mearns. On the same occasion, Duncan, the twelfth Earl of Fife, gave the prior and canons the church of Kilgour;[2] and the bishop himself is said to have given them the churches of Abercrombie and Dairsey; though, as to the latter, it is not easy to reconcile this with the Register of the Priory, which represents that church as previously belonging to them.

The above splendid instances of the bishop's munificence may, in some degree, balance his previous duplicity. No sufficient apology, indeed, can be made for him: but his conduct may be palliated by the circumstances of the times, when the hostility of contending factions, the influence of bad example and party spirit, and the universal persuasion that the end justified the means, (a persuasion far from being repudiated even in our times,) obliterated from the mind the common notions of right and wrong, and thus converted what was essentially criminal, into what was lauded by many as praiseworthy.

But we must return again to Edward III. He no doubt heard of what was going on at St Andrews; and though he had received no encouragement from the pope to attempt the removal of Bishop Lamberton, yet, de-

[1] See a translation of this bull in Appendix XXIV.
[2] Sir J. Balfour's Annals, vol. i. p. 96.

termined to make one more effort to effect his purpose, he wrote to his holiness from York, in November 1319, as follows:—"The king devoutly, &c. We lately, holy father, supplicated you, by our letters, in behalf of the religious Thomas de Rivers of the order of Minor friars, (of whose probity and piety we had obtained the fullest assurance,) whom Pope Clement V., your predecessor of happy memory, had, as we understood, preferred to the see of St Andrews, in Scotland, having doomed William, bishop of the same, to perpetual imprisonment, for having betrayed him—hoping that the register of your said predecessor would have confirmed our statement. Whereupon your holiness writes, that it does not appear from your registers, nor upon any other good evidence," &c. (He then goes on to repeat the contents of the pope's foregoing letter, after which he proceeds thus:) "But though we have not the apostolical letters appointing the said Thomas to the bishopric of St Andrews, yet we have certainly learnt that the said William de Lamberton attaches himself to Robert de Bruce our enemy, in contempt of his oath, and of holy mother church, and to our great detriment; and thus, as the favourer of the said Robert, risks the sentence not only of excommunication, but of deprivation; and fears not to violate the papal interdict proclaimed in Scotland, but profanes the holy solemnities, by causing them to be performed by excommunicated persons. Therefore, that the audacity and disobedience of this bishop may not prove an incentive to others to rebel against us, we entreat that it may please your holiness to summon him to your presence, and answer to you in regard to the premises; with a view to his removal from the office of which he has made himself so unworthy, and the substitution in his place of the said Thomas, who is recommended

by so many virtues."[1] No answer seems to have been returned to this letter.

The last time we hear of Bishop Lamberton, in his political capacity, is his being one of the Scottish commissioners at York, in 1324, for endeavouring to effect a peace between the two kingdoms.

His name occurs only twice in the Register of the Priory; once when he confirms the church of Dairsey to the prior and canons, p. 120; and again, where he sanctions Bishop Fraser's appropriation of the church of Leuchars to the pressing wants of the same body, p. 400. But we meet with him in the Dennylne charters, No. 11, where he commands the priory of May, which had paid sixteen marks annually to its former superior the abbey of Reading, to pay that sum in future to the priory of St Andrews. And in Nos. 14 and 16, he directs the "dean of Christianity," in Fife, to put the priory in possession of the churches of Dairsey and Abercromby, with a view to defray the expense of improving the celebration of divine worship in his cathedral church. Finally, in p. xl of the "Excerpta," he confirms to the abbey of Dunfermline the church of Kinross, and the chapel of Urwell.

All that remains of Bishop Lamberton's seal, is a waxen fragment, representing St Andrew extended upon his cross, and the bishop in the attitude of prayer below, with the imperfect legend—"..... de Lāberton epi Sti Andree."[2]

Wyntoun, who wrote only fifty years after Lamberton, thus speaks of his death, and the position of his tomb with reference to those of Bishops Gameline and Trail, the latter of whom was the chronicler's contemporary:—

[1] Rymer, vol. iii. p. 794.

[2] For a more minute description of this seal, see Appendix XXIII.

That year Williame of Lambertoun,
Byshop of Sanct Andrewys toun,
In the prioris chaumber of that abbay,
Of hys lyfe closed the latter day.
Byshop he was thretty year,
And ruled his state in fayre mannere:
And in the north half of the new kyrk
Cathedrale, an arch he gart men wyrk,
Now seen between tombis twa,
Of Gamelyne the eastmost is of tha.
And in the space that was levyd [1]
Between the pulpit and hys hevyd [2]
An arch of fayre work and of fyne,
The byshop Walter gart make syne.
Under that tomb now lyis he.
Thus lying are these byshopis three,
On the north half of the hygh kyrk,
In tombis that themselves gart wyrk.

Of these tombs, in common with those of the many bishops and archbishops who are buried in the metropolitan church of Scotland, not a vestige is to be traced! How many disorders, and even crimes, have been committed in the sacred name of Reformation!

Lamberton died, it is said, in "the prior's chamber of the abbey." His castle of St Andrews had been taken and retaken four different times within the previous twenty-five years; and was, probably, either so much injured as to be uninhabitable by him, or so full of soldiers as not to leave room sufficient for the household which he would require to attend him.

There were two priors of the monastery during this administration, namely, Adam de Mauchan and John de Forfar. The former had been previously Archdeacon of St Andrews. "He governed his monastery for nine years, amidst the storms and troubles of the war which then raged between England and Scotland. He died in 1313, and was buried on the right side of the grave of John [Haddenton] his predecessor." He was succeeded by John de Forfar, a canon of the same

[1] Raised. [2] Head.

house, who had been Vicar of Lochrife, and Bishop Lamberton's chamberlain, and was now elected prior, *per viam Sancti Spiritus*.[1] "He built the chamber adjoining the cloister, which the priors were afterwards wont to use, and which William de Loudon, one of his successors, surrounded by a strong wall." He died in 1321, and was the first to be buried in the new chapter-house which Bishop Lamberton had constructed. His name does not appear in the Register; and Adam de Mauchan's only once, at the time he was archdeacon, as witness to a deed in the year 1300, p. 120. In fact, that volume is, at this period, and for some years after, peculiarly barren of information, which is no doubt owing to its being in an incomplete state.

CHAPTER VII.

Lives and Times of the Bishops of St Andrews, from the Succession of James de Bane, in 1328, *till the Death of James Kennedy, the last Bishop of St Andrews, in* 1466.

XXX. James de Bane, A.D. 1328–1332.

"The chapter, after Lamberton's death, meeting for the election of a new bishop, went into factions, the one half voting for Sir James Bane[2] archdeacon of St

[1] There were three ways of electing the prior. 1st, *Per viam Sancti Spiritus*, which, I presume, meant, by lot; 2dly, *Per viam Scrutinii*, or, *per electionem*, which seems to have been by vote; and, 3dly, *Per viam compromissi*, which meant, by mutual agreement.

[2] Sir, here and elsewhere, is the translation of *dominus*, which, it is well known, often means *lord*, and often cannot be conveniently translated into English.

Andrews, the other half for Sir Alexander Kinninmonth archdeacon of Lothian. But Bane, being then in the court of Rome, and advertised of the bishop's death, obtained the bishoprick of the pope, (John XXII.,) who, in those times, disposed of all church livings as he thought good, having no regard to canonical election."[1]

> When dead was Williame of Lambertoune,
> Next him in successioune,
> Byshop was made Jamys Ben
> Archdeacon of Sanct Andrewys then.
> Four yearis and monethis twa
> Byshop he was, nought ou'r tha
> Lasting into lyfe three dayis,
> As of hym the Chronykle sayis.

That is, he was bishop no longer than four years, two months, and three days.

Kinninmonth, disappointed of St Andrews, went to Rome, where he succeeded, the next year, in getting the bishopric of Aberdeen; while Cumyn, the Provost of the Culdees, who, thirty years before, opposed the election of Lamberton, but without success, now received the archdeaconry of Lothian as some compensation for his disappointment.

After the death of Robert I., in 1329, a regent had been appointed to govern the kingdom during the minority of David II., who was then only six years old. At this time, the youthful king was much in St Andrews; for many of his charters are dated here,[2] in the first year of his reign. The year before, he had been betrothed to Johanna, daughter of Edward II., and in 1331 they were both crowned by Bishop Bane at Scone; on which occasion, by command of the pope, the ceremony of *anointing* was first used in crowning the Kings of Scotland.

[1] Spotswood, p. 55. Fordun, lib. vi. cap. 45.
[2] See Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum.

A thousand three hundyr, thretty and ane,
Then Robert the Brucys dayis all gane,
Davy the Bruce then hys young son
Past with honest court to Scone.
The byshop of Sanct Andrewys then,
That called by name was Jamy Ben,
There made hys coronatioune,
With solemn and hallowed unctioune.
Oynted before hym was na kyng
That Scotland had in governyng.
John the twa and twentyed pope
Sent hys bull to that byshop
Byddand that that kyng suld be
Oynted when that crowned was he;
And so, all kyngis of Scotland
After that suld be there regnand.[1]

But the prospects of David and his adherents met with a sudden and unexpected blow. For Edward Baliol, the son of the late King John, being persuaded, by some of his friends, to try his fortune in Scotland, came over from the Continent the very next year; and, having succeeded in gaining the battle of Dupplin, was immediately after crowned king at Scone by the Bishop of Dunkeld. In this state of things, both David and the Bishop of St Andrews were reduced to the necessity of seeking refuge, the former in France, the latter in Flanders. "Bishop Bane," says Fordun, "fearing the ferocity and intolerable cruelty of the English, after the battle of Dupplin, came by night from Lochleven to St Andrews, and, bidding the prior and canons a hasty farewell, embarked for Flanders, where he speedily arrived." His castle was immediately taken possession of by the enemy. But he did not long survive this calamity; for, in September the same year, he died, and was buried in the Augustinian

[1] A full account of this ceremony was in the Magnum Registrum of St Andrews, under the title of "Relatio quo David, filius Roberti regis, factus fuit miles, anno 1331, par Thomam Ranulphum comitem Moravie; per licentiam Comitis de Fyfe; et postea coronatus fuit per Jacobum Ben episcopum S. Andree apud Scone dominica proxima;" but the work is lost. See the Register, p. xxvi.

monastery at Bourges, the following words being inscribed on his monument:—Hic jacet bonæ memoriæ Jacobus dominus de Bane episcopus Sancti Andreæ in Scotia nostræ religionis qui obiit xxii. die Sept. ann. dom. M.CCC.XXXII. 'Orate pro eo." Wyntoun thus records the same event:—

That ilk year Jamys Ben,
The byshop of Sanct Andrewys then,
To Brugys past ow'r the sea;
Hys latter day there closed he.
In the abbey of Akount (there
Canons are foundyt regulare)
Interred well hys body lyis
His spyrit intil paradyse.
Sanct Andrewys see, yearis nyne
After that, was vacand syne.

I find no mention of this bishop in the Register of the Priory, and only once in the Dennylne papers, No. 9, which I have already quoted, p. 12.

The cause of the nine-years' vacancy of the see above alluded to by Wyntoun, was, that Edward III. had recommended an ecclesiastic of his own to fill it, whom the pope refused to confirm. His letters to John XXII. on this subject, are too curious to be omitted. He must, no doubt, have been very earnest in his desire to put one of his own friends into the vacant bishopric, when he condescended repeatedly to solicit this favour from the same pope, who had rejected a similar application on a former occasion. His first letter is dated at York, 26th October, 1333. "The king devoutly kisses the pope's feet. The respect which your paternal providence always evinced to our predecessors, to ourselves, and to our kingdom, assures us that you will grant whatever may conduce to our honour and our peace. Therefore, father, seeing how uncertain the fidelity of the Scottish nation is towards us, and desiring that one who loves peace, and is favourably disposed to us and our kingdom, should be

promoted to the bishopric of St Andrews in Scotland, now vacant, (one who may instruct the unruly Scotch, coerce them by spiritual discipline, reclaim them from error, and guide them into truth,) we recently besought that you would be pleased to grant the presentation of that church to one whom we would shortly name to be its pastor and bishop. And now, accordingly, after due inquiry, we offer and recommend, with all earnestness, the venerable Robert de Ayleston archdeacon of Berks, our treasurer, as a man of wise counsel, well learned, and of approved conversation, humbly imploring that the apostolic see may condescend to advance him to the said bishopric of St Andrews."

To the above letter the pope made no reply; and, therefore, in March the following year, Edward writes again :—"The king, &c. Considering the trouble and bloodshed which prevail, through the fierce wars of the English and Scotch, and being desirous to obviate such calamities for the time to come, we lately entreated your clemency, (which has always been favourably disposed towards us,) first, that you would vouchsafe to keep open for a time the vacancy in the church of St Andrews; and, afterwards, that you would present thereto our Treasurer, Robert de Ayleston archdeacon of Berks, who is commended for the purity of his morals and his great learning, and whom we believe to be fitter for the office than any other person. And now, hearing that some others are supplicating your holiness in favour of a different person, (which, if granted, would be very displeasing to us, at a time when there is so much need for a prudent and able prelate for the said church,) we again implore your holiness, with renewed entreaties, that you would be pleased to appoint the said Robert de Ayleston, by whose care the church may flourish, both in spiritual

and temporal concerns, and the refractory people in those parts be curbed and subdued. Or, at least, that you would condescend, in pity to the church, to sustain the election of a bishop by its own chapter, that thus, being able to provide for its own wants, it may both honour God and satisfy our just desires."

Still the haughty pontiff observed a profound silence; and, in the July following, the king once more thus addresses him in favour of a different person:—"The king, &c. Considering how many and great dangers have arisen to England and Scotland from the prolongation of the war, we naturally seek that whereby the points at issue between the two nations may be settled. On which account, we lately besought your clemency to be pleased to appoint to the vacant bishopric of St Andrews a well-qualified person to be nominated by us, and we accordingly recommended Robert de Ayleston archdeacon of Berks. Notwithstanding, disregarding our wishes, you have failed to make this appointment. We, therefore, urgently renew our entreaties to your holiness, that you would vouchsafe to promote to the said bishopric, our secretary, Robert de Tanton, who, while we were in Scotland, held, and still holds, a distinguished place about our person, whom we esteem to be in all respects eminently fitted for the office, and who is held in high favour by many of the nobility and people of both kingdoms; and thus manifest that kindness which you have always shown to us and our royal house. Given at Berwick, 4th July, 1333."

With a view to ensure a favourable answer to this letter, Edward wrote, at the same time, to the Cardinal of St Stephen de Cœlio Monte, to beg he would use all his endeavours to get the pope to advance Robert de Tanton to the bishopric. But all was to no purpose. There is no mention of a reply to any of

the foregoing letters; and it is at least certain that the royal request was not granted.

During this interval, the friends of David II. were not idle. Scotland was again the scene of a civil war; for the old contest was renewed, but with increased violence, against Edward III. as the patron of Edward Baliol, which had been carried on against his predecessors as the patrons of John; the real object of the English monarchs being, to subject Scotland to their own authority. In 1335, a convention of nobles was held at Dairsey, near St Andrews, among whom were the Stewart and the Earl of Moray, with a view to uphold the cause of the royal family of Bruce; but, owing to the opposition of Cumyn earl of Athole, who was secretly in the interest of the English king, and the family feuds of the other nobles there assembled, they parted without coming to any definite agreement. But Sir Andrew Murray, who had now been appointed Regent of Scotland in behalf of David, succeeded, the following year, in wresting from the English numerous fortresses which had at first fallen into their hands. Among these was the castle of St Andrews, which he took after a three-weeks' siege; and, as the issue of the struggle was at that time doubtful, he entirely demolished this structure, that it might not again fall into the hands of the English. Happily his successes were speedily followed up both by himself and his successor in office, Robert the Stewart. This paved the way for the restoration of the banished family, though that event did not take place till some years after.

Meanwhile, John of Gowrie was prior of the monastery of St Andrews. He and his canons suffered much from the civil dissensions. "Though of a free tongue," says Fordun, "and incautious of speech, he yet ruled his monastery with great skill, prudently

providing against misfortunes, and, when they befell him, warding them off with dexterity." He died in 1340, and was buried in the new chapter-house. The English, in an attack upon Perth, had demolished its walls and towers; and they compelled the six nearest or wealthiest monasteries to contribute funds to rebuild them. One of these was St Andrews, whose proportion of the expense amounted to 280 silver marks, or about £2800 of modern money.

XXXI. William de Landel, A.D. 1341–1385.

When the news of Bane's death arrived in Scotland, the prior and canons chose for their bishop, says Wyntoun,

> Master Williame Bell, then
> That was Dean of Dunkelden.

to which election the Culdees offered no opposition. This dignitary immediately repaired to Rome, according to the practice of that time, for confirmation; but he found the pope prepossessed in favour of Landel, provost of the collegiate church of Kinkell, who had been strongly recommended to him by David II. and the King of France. It so happened that Bell, soon after this, was attacked by a complaint in his eyes, which deprived him of his sight; upon which, he renounced all pretensions to the bishopric, returned home, and assumed the habit of St Augustine in the priory of St Andrews, where he died in 1342. But I always prefer giving Wyntoun's simple account of these matters, whenever it can be obtained.

> Syne
> The chapiter by electioune
> Chused a famous gret persoune
> Master Williame Bell, then
> That was Dean of Dunkelden—
> Nevertheless, as he thocht,
> That byshopric obtained he noucht,

For blind of bathe hys een fell he ;
Sa nyne year vacand was that see.
Williame de Landelys, when that fell
(That tyme Persoun of Kinkell)
In Fraunce was a young clerk than,
Of lineage a gret gentil-man,
Aspired to this byshoprick
Vacand so lang in our kynrick.
Hys friends moved the Kyng of Fraunce
For this Williame to make instaunce,
And through prayer to the pope
This Williame that he would make byshop
Of Sanct Andrewys see vacand.
And the Kyng Davy of Scotland,
That dwelland was in Normandy,
Wrote to the pope then specially,
For this Landelys that he micht be
Promovyd to this vacand see.
Yet bade this see still vacand
Of Sanct Andrewys in Scotland,
Til after that the chapiter
Great instaunce made, and thro' prayer
Til the twelft Bennet pope
This Landelys for til make byshop
At their instaunce ; for that see
Vacate too lang in their country ;
And the kyrk into that whyle,
Aye stood in doute and in peryle,
And scathis thold and disease [1]
All tyme that it vacand was ;
Nor until a vacatioun
They would nocht make electioun
Twyce, for they trowed that were
Something to the law contrare.
To the pope they wrote for-thi [2]
All the mare effectually.
The pope ressaved their letters weel
And sped their instaunce ilka deal,
And so gart this Williame be
Promovyd to this lang vacand see.—
Then byshop he was, til past ou'r
In hys time forty year and four.
Of hys ending ye may hear
In tyme to come of that matere.

Fordun says, concerning Bishop Landel, that he was lord of all the lands of Lauderdale, and yet modest,

[1] *i. e.* It suffered detriment and damage.
[2] On this account.

mild, and ingenuous; and that he loved his canons as much as if they had been his own children.

The year after this bishop's succession, David II. returned home; and to be revenged on the English for the support they had given to his rival, he made various incursions into the north of England, which he laid waste with fire and sword. In one of these, at a place called Neville's Cross, near Durham, his troops were surprised and defeated by Sir John Copland, the English commander, when the king was made prisoner, and sent to London. This happened in the year 1346. Spotswood, who is very brief in this part of his history, and had not the same means of information which we now possess, asserts that Bishop Landel was taken prisoner with the king, and that 100,000 marks were paid for his ransom; the very sum which was afterwards paid for the king. But in this, I think, the good archbishop has made a mistake. I am not aware of any previous historian who relates the fact, except Froissart, who, nevertheless, does not include the bishop in his list of prisoners. Wyntoun, who has a long chapter on the battle, and mentions many of the prisoners by name, and who never fails to state everything remarkable concerning the bishops of St Andrews, says nothing of Landel's capture. Fordun is also silent on the subject; and, what is still more conclusive, Rymer's Fœdera does not contain a single document regarding his imprisonment, ransom, or release, which it must have done had Spotswood's information been correct. It is, however, certain that the bishop was very early employed by his nation, along with others, to negotiate for the king's release from captivity.[1] The Rotuli Scotiæ contain no less than twenty-

[1] In Rymer's Fœdera, vol. iv. p. 42, there is a deed signed by the Scottish bishops, empowering those of St Andrews, Brechin, and Caithness, to treat with Edward III. for the ransom of David, and pledging

one safe-conducts, granted to him, either singly, with his usual number of attendants, (consisting of thirty horsemen, with their grooms,[1]) or in company with other bishops and noblemen; in which case, of course, a much greater number of followers is comprehended. It should be observed, however, that after the king's actual liberation in 1357, he was still considered in the light of a prisoner, and is so named in public documents, till the conditions of his ransom were fulfilled, viz., till the money for him was paid in full, and the hostages restored. On this account, about as many of the bishop's missions to England were performed after the king's personal liberation as before it.

The migratory propensities of this bishop were indeed remarkable: not only did he make twenty-one different journeys to England, relative to the ransom of his king, but he performed a pilgrimage to the shrine of St James, (of Compostella in Spain, I presume,) in the year 1361, with twenty horsemen; another in company with William de Douglas, the year following, to the shrine of Thomas-à-Becket, with twenty-eight persons; a third to Rome, the next year, with twenty-four persons; and a fourth in 1365, to a foreign country, *ultra mare*, which is not named. Safe-conducts to all of these places, *through* England, are given in the above-mentioned work.

Wyntoun relates, that the king and the bishop passed the Christmas of 1362 in Morayshire, the one at Kinloss abbey, the other at Elgin, in order to

themselves to abide by whatever terms they should agree upon. It is dated Edinburgh, 26th September, 1357.

[1] Cum triginta equitibus et eorum garcionibus. Tytler translates this, "thirty knights with their squires." Perhaps we should be nearer the mark were we to call the latter *grooms*. Even of these *equites* there were different ranks; for in a safe-conduct granted to Landel and others in 1352, they were to be attended "cum ducentis equitibus cujuscunque status vel conditionis fuerint." See a copy of this last in Appendix XXV.

avoid a pestilence which was then raging in the south of Scotland.

> Intil Kynloss that year for-thi,
> In Moray held the kyng Davy
> Hys Yule. And of Sanct Andrewys than
> The Byshop de Landelys, that gude man,
> In Elgyn held hys Yule that year.
> Wyth them twa, mony lordis sere,[1]
> Kept them in the north land,
> Whyle the pest was in south wedand.[2]

Part of the next year the king spent with the bishop at his palace of Inchmurtach. Here he married his second wife, Margaret Logie, (the daughter or widow, it is not certain which, of a Sir John Logie,) a woman of uncommon beauty. But the unequal alliance proved unhappy.

> A thousand three hundyr syxty and three
> Year after the Natyvity,
> In Inchmurtho the kyng Davy
> Weddyt dame Margaret of Logie
> In the moneth of Apryle.
> They were togedyr but short whyle.

And yet they were long enough together to make pilgrimages to some of the most noted shrines in England, in the superstitious hope of thereby obtaining issue. At length David repudiated her; on which she went to Italy to complain to the pope, who received her as Queen of Scotland, and sent orders to her husband, under severe penalties, to take her back to him. Of the result, as well as of the exact date of her death, we are not informed.[3]

David wished at this time, failing issue, to settle his crown upon one of the sons of Edward III. of England. To this his nobles objected in the strongest terms, and compelled him to sign an engagement, dated

[1] Several. [2] Raging.

[3] There is some mystery connected with her disagreement with the king. It is certain, however, that she survived him.

at Inchmurtach, 14th May, 1363, in which he pledged himself never again to make so offensive a proposal.

About this time the inhabitants of Cupar-Fife obtained a charter of commercial privileges from David II. This they supposed should have excluded the burgesses of St Andrews from the right of trading in their burgh, free of impost, which the latter had always hitherto exercised in virtue of their own more ancient charter; but to this restriction the bishop and burgesses of St Andrews refused to submit. A litigation in consequence ensued between the two burghs, which was ultimately decided by the parliament, which met at Perth in 1369, in favour of St Andrews, whereby this city was empowered to buy and sell wool, hides, and other articles of traffic, as formerly, within the limits of Cupar. In reference to the commercial enterprise of this period, I may remark here, that a few years before, the Rotuli Scotiæ exhibit a safe-conduct into England, for four burgess-merchants of St Andrews, each having four equestrian companions to attend him.[1]

The last public act in which we find Landel engaged, was in crowning King Robert II., after the death of David in 1370. We know, from other sources, that he performed this ceremony,[2] although Wyntoun merely notices the fact, without mentioning the bishop.

> The kyng set syne a certain day,
> And for hys crowning gart purvey,
> Where richly then purveyed was he.
> Hys men there made him fealty.
> Was nane that wold agayne him stand,
> He was hale kyng ow'r all the land.

In the year 1378, a great part of the cathedral of St Andrews was unfortunately burnt by some accident, exactly fifty years after it had been finished and dedi-

[1] See a copy of this in Appendix XXVII.
[2] Acts of the Scottish Parliament, A.D. 1371.

cated. Boethius says, it was either by lightning, or by a jackdaw carrying a burning twig into its nest. Wyntoun, in a part of his Chronicle which we will quote presently, describes the repairs of the damage thus caused; from which it would appear that the roof and wood-work of the choir, the roofs of the east aisles of both "cross-kirks" (transepts,) with four pillars and two "to-falls" (porches) in the same, a fourth part of the centre steeple, and nine pillars in the nave, were destroyed by this fire, and partially repaired by the joint efforts of Bishop Landel and Prior Stephen de Pay, before their death. The burning of a cathedral, in whole or in part, was far from being an uncommon occurrence in those times. There were few either in England or Scotland, which escaped this calamity. There were even instances of the same cathedral suffering two or three times from fire, which probably arose from the contiguity of the monastic buildings, where fires must have been in constant use, or from the *ustrinæ* which were employed for heating the incense in the church.

It must be remembered that Wyntoun was a young canon of the priory at the time of Bishop Landel's death, and probably, therefore, witnessed the scene of his funeral, which he thus describes:—

Williame de Landelys, that gude man,
Of Sanct Andrewys byshop than,
Closed of his lyfe the last day
In the east chaumbre of that abbay,
When in hys sickness he had tane
Hys sacramentis all ilkane.
And of the gudis that he had,
Hys testament he freely made.
The cardynal his exequyes
Made, and did full servyce.
Of Dunkelden the byshop John,
To that exequyes came anon.
Interred he was solemnly
With mony prelatis and worthy,

That ilk day rycht sevyn year
That that kyrk was brynt, but were.[1]
Under earth rycht pryvily
Early laid was hys body,
When there were private masses done ;
For it was trowed that after soon,
The cardynal suld come bodily
And do hys exequyes honourably,
They gart the solemnity
Til hys coming delayit be.

The bishop closed his life in the "east chaumber of the abbay," no doubt because his castle of St Andrews, which had been demolished in 1335, was not yet rebuilt.

The cardinal here spoken of was Cardinal Wardlaw, then Bishop of Glasgow. It would seem that a private funeral took place in the first instance, and the public one was delayed till the arrival of the cardinal, the Bishop of Dunkeld, and other prelates. According to Fordun, he died on St Thecla's day, (15th October,) and "was buried before the vestibule of the great church, under a stone curiously wrought," (sub artificioso lapide.)

It will be noticed, in the foregoing extract, that Wyntoun says of Landel—

And of the gudis that he had
Hys testament he freely made.

This is an allusion which would not be very easily understood, did we not know that it had hitherto been the practice for the kings of Scotland, or their officials, to take possession of the personal property of the bishops after their death. But Landel procured a bull from Pope Gregory XI., in 1375, putting a stop to this unjust practice, and giving the bishops full power to bequeath their property as they pleased.

[1] "But were," *i. e.* without doubt. The expression here and elsewhere is a mere expletive (and certainly not a very elegant one) to rhyme with *year*.

The waxen impression of this bishop's seal, has St Andrew on his cross, with a shield on each side, and the bishop in the attitude of prayer below, who has also a shield on each side of him: the legend is "S. Wilelmi Dei gracia epi. Scti. Andree." The devices on the shields are very indistinct. Bishop Landel's name does not occur in the Register; but in the Chartulary of Melrose,[1] there is a mandate addressed by him to the clergy of his diocese, dated Holyrood, 1342, requiring them to coöperate with the monks of Melrose in inflicting ecclesiastical punishment on all who should be guilty of invading their lands, or seizing their property.

There were three successive priors during this episcopate. The first was William de Loudon, who had before been sub-prior, and was chosen to the priorate, *ver viam scrutinii*, at the time the bishopric was vacant. "The works he performed," says Fordun, "both within and without the monastery, have made his name illustrious. He covered the whole dormitory with a magnificent roof; beneath, with polished planks, and above with lead. He also roofed the old church of St Regulus,[2] the eastern chamber, the four sides of the cloister, and the south part of the refectory. He caused to be made, at the expense of the monastery, the curtain (velum) which was suspended, during Lent, between the altar and the choir, composed of curious work, and admirably embroidered with figures of men and animals. Moreover, he built the new *ustrina*[3] at great labour and expense. The churches belonging to the monastery in Fife and elsewhere, he roofed with tim-

[1] Vol. ii. p. 397.

[2] No doubt this was one of the roofs of which the traces may yet be seen on the side of the square tower.

[3] The *ustrina*, I believe, contained fire for heating the thuribles or censors, and served also for keeping the officiating clergy warm in cold weather.

ber, and supplied with necessary furniture. Perceiving the church of Rossieclerach, in Gowrie, to be old and insufficient, he built a very handsome one instead of it, though not on the same site. This prior was short of stature, and well skilled in learning. He calmly submitted to the great, for the sake of his monastery. He enforced the regular observance of the rules of his order; and thus he not only governed, but greatly improved his monastery, freed it from debt, and replenished it with many necessary things, especially with a hundred volumes for its library. He died in 1354, and was buried near his predecessor, John of Gowrie, in the new chapter-house." The only mention I find of him in the Register of the Priory, p. 404, is his letting, in the year 1347, to one Andrew Gray, a half davoch of land in Cuneveth, (Laurenceckirk,) for a gradually increasing rent, and on certain conditions which are specified in the document.

The next prior was Thomas Bisset, who, like his predecessor, had been sub-prior, and was chosen *per viam scrutinii;* "a man of noble family, (he was the nephew of the Earl of Fife,) but of still nobler disposition; for he dearly loved his brethren, and was no less beloved by them. He ruled the flock committed to his care as wisely as the times would permit. The Lord was with him, and directed all his ways. He kept constantly in mind the rules and institutes of the holy fathers, which he loved and observed, admonishing his brethren to observe them also. The manners of the canons he diligently reformed; mildly corrected them for their faults, and encouraged the good, knowing that hereunto he was called. When he had thus for nine years governed his monastery, he fell into bad health; and, fearing that thereby the expenses of the house would increase, he resigned the management of it into the hands of the bishop, but not without the

lamentation and expostulation of his brethren, who exclaimed, 'Why, O father, dost thou desert us? be favourable, and leave us not thus destitute.'"

After his resignation, Stephen de Pay, the sub-prior, was elected in his stead, *per viam sancti spiritus*, "venerabilis vir et omni morum honestate præditus. He received his confirmation and blessing from the hands of the bishop. In stature he was large, in countenance agreeable; munificent in everything, and beloved by all." As has already been observed, it was in his time that the cathedral was burnt, and partially repaired by the united exertions of himself and Bishop Landel. Fordun's account of this is, simply, that all the stone, wood, and lead work on the east side of the church, was renewed, including two pillars close to the altars of St Michael and St Laurence; and that the whole expense amounted to 2200 marks sterling, or about £18,000 of our money. But Wyntoun is much more particular in his description; and, as he was living in the monastery at the time the repairs were made, I will here quote his own words:—

In this tyme of these lordis twa
After the brynning of the kyrk,
After as they gart wyrkmen wyrk,
All the wood wyrk of the quere,[1]
With roof of lead, was made but were.
Of the cross-kyrk the islis twa,
With lead the south isle roofed alswa,
The north isle, and the quere,
The to-falls twa were made but were.
In roof and ilka wyrk of tree
Then wroucht rycht weel men mycht them see.
Twa pillaris new on ilka syde
In that cross-kyrk were made that tyde,
As ye may see them appearand
Under the auld wyrk yet standand.
A quarter of the steeple of stane[2]
Was made, ere the sevyn year were gane

[1] Choir.

[2] This proves there was a steeple in the centre of the cathedral.

And in the body of the kyrk
On the south half, they gart wyrk
Fra the west door on that syde,
East on, nyne pillaris in that tyde,
Wyth help of some lordis sere,
As by their armis ye see appear.
Lyttle above sevyn yearis they gart wyrk,
And make all this wyrk of the kyrk.
This byshop Williame de Landelys
Adorned hys kyrk wyth fair jewelis:
Vestmentis, bookis, and other moe
Pleasant playokis,[1] he gave also.

It will appear afterwards, that though "these lordis twa" did so much, their labours required to be followed up by subsequent bishops and priors, before the whole damage caused by the destructive fire was repaired. The repairs were not finished till about the year 1440; and the pope, in the meantime, authorized the tithes of the parishes of Cuneveth, Adale, Essy, Lintrethyne, Cupar, Kilconquhar, Creth, Tarvet, Kennothy, Markinch, and Monimeal, to be expended in defraying them.[2] Such were the immense sacrifices made in those ages to keep the temples of God in suitable repair.

Neither Stephen de Pay nor Thomas Bisset is mentioned in the Register of the Priory.

XXXII. Stephen de Pay, A.D. 1385. Elect.

After the death of Bishop Landel, Stephen de Pay, who had been prior of the monastery during twenty years, and had signalized himself by his exertions in repairing the cathedral, was unanimously chosen by the canons to succeed him. But on his voyage to Rome, whither he was going to solicit confirmation, he was taken prisoner by the English, and carried to Alnwick, where he fell sick and died the same year.

[1] Perhaps musical bells.
[2] Dunmylne Charters. Appendix VII., No. 92.

When they the exequyes had done,
The priore and the convent soon
A day to their electioun set,
As they suld have done of debt.
That day hale the chapiter
Togyder chusit concorditer
Then Stephen Pay with honour,
That was of that place the priour.
So after that electioun,
To get full executioun
Of that state, as hys part was,
He made him to the court to pass.
He in hot war the Inglismen
But in hot war the Inglismen
Had on the sea their bargis then:
So was he takyn upon sea,
And intil Alnwyck died he.

The "hot war" that was then raging between England and Scotland, was owing to the latter country having recently renewed the "ancient alliance" with France; in consequence of which, Robert II. had called home all Scotchmen who were engaged in the English service, and, with the help of a thousand French men-at-arms, began ravaging the English Borders. This provoked the King of England, who not only, this very year, marched a large army into Scotland, but sent out numerous "bargis" to annoy his enemies at sea, one of which fell in with and captured the unfortunate Bishop of St Andrews. In those times, when a prisoner of distinction fell into the hands of the enemy, he was not liberated without a heavy ransom: and though Stephen de Pay was only bishop elect, he knew he could not be ransomed but for a much larger sum than the bishopric and the priory together could afford to pay, after the heavy expense they had recently incurred by the repairs of the cathedral. On this account, we are told that he piously resigned himself to the will of Providence; and welcomed the approach of death, which would not only cause his see to be filled up at once, but put an end to his sufferings, and save his brethren from

any debt which they might be disposed to incur with a view to effect his release.[1]

XXXIII. Walter Trail, A.D. 1385–1401.

Before his appointment, Trail had been a canon of St Andrews, and, having studied with great repute in foreign parts, had commenced doctor both of civil and canon law. At the time now under our review, the grand schism in the papacy had begun, which lasted thirty-six years, during which period there were two, and at one time, three, contemporaneous popes, one at Rome, and the others elsewhere, each claiming to be the legitimate successor of St Peter. But it is material to observe, that the Roman popes are put down in the regular succession, while the others, having been deposed by general councils, were erased from the list. In the year 1385, Urban VI. was the pope at Rome, while another cardinal, under the title of Clement VII., claimed the same dignity at Avignon. Italy, Germany, and England supported the former,—France, Spain, and Scotland adhered to the latter. Trail, happening to be in the office of "referendarius" at the court of Clement when the news arrived of Bishop Stephen's death, immediately received the bishopric from that pontiff; the latter complimenting him by saying, that "he was more fit to be a pope than a bishop, and that the place was better provided than the person." Fordun says of him, that he was "pugil ecclesiæ, miles legum, doctor canonum, et omnibus artibus liberalibus præditus."

> The sevynd Clement, that tyme pope,
> Made Master Walter Trail byshop,
> The whylk was hys familiar,
> And in the court then referandar.

[1] Fordun, lib. vi. cap. 46.

Every catholic country had an officer at the Roman court called a "referendarius," or envoy, whose business it was to lay before the pontiff and cardinals the petitions he received from his constituents, to transmit their answers, and, generally, to watch over the interests of the church in the country which he represented. Trail had been this officer for Scotland at Avignon.

In the year 1390, the Bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow assisted at the funeral of Robert II. at Scone; and, on the following day, the former placed the crown on the head of Robert III. The two ceremonies are thus described by Wyntoun, who very probably witnessed them.

Of this August the threteenth day,
As before I begoud[1] to say,
And the foresaid year in Scone
The exequyes solempne were done
Of Robert our secund kyng,
That Scotland had in governyng.
The byshop that tyme of Glasgow,
Of Glendwynyn Syre Mathew,
Of the *requiem* did that mass;
And there that day alswa was
The Byshop of Sanct Andrewys see,
Syre Walter Trail then cald was he;
He made the collatioun
In gret commendatioun
Of the body, that on that wyse
That day they did there that servyce.
And on the morn syne afterwart
Crowned was the thryd Robert,
The secund Robert's ayre and son
Into that ilk kyrk of Scone.
The Byshop of Sanct Andrewys see
Walter wyth great solemnity
Gave our kyng there the crown
Hys sword, hys sceptre, and unctioun.

In the following year, the bishop was sent to France,

[1] Began.

Scotland's ally, with a view to effect a truce between these two nations and England, each of which appointed commissioners to meet and settle the preliminaries. This negotiation lasted twelve months, but was attended with no satisfactory result. Wyntoun simply records the fact.

The Rotuli Scotiæ contain a safe conduct for this bishop and others, in 1393, to convey them to England; and another, in 1398, to enable him to go to the same country, that he might be a party to a treaty about to be entered into between the two nations.

At Scone, in 1398, the king solemnly created his brother, Duke of Albany, and his own eldest son, Duke of Rothesay; on which occasion the Bishop of St Andrews celebrated divine service and preached a sermon.[1] This was the first time that the honour of the dukedom was conferred on any Scottish subject.

It will not be going out of our way to mention, that our bishop was employed to pronounce sentence of absolution upon the well-known Sir Alexander Stewart, youngest son of Robert II., commonly called the "Wolf of Badenoch." This ferocious youth and his followers, in consequence of their having seized some lands belonging to the Bishop of Moray, were formally excommunicated by that prelate. Out of revenge for this affront, they set fire to the town, cathedral, and monastery of Elgin, all of which were, in consequence, very seriously injured. The two last suffered so much, that it required no less than forty years to restore them to their original state.[2] For

[1] Fordun, lib. xv. cap. 4.

[2] It has been supposed by many, that the Cathedral of Elgin was reduced to the state in which we now see it by the "Wolf of Badenoch." This is a mistake. It was completely restored by the piety and munificence of succeeding bishops. But soon after the Reformation, it was deliberately destroyed, or nearly so, by a more systematic plunderer than the "Wolf of Badenoch," namely, the well-known Regent Moray, who seems to have had no greater delight than

this wanton outrage, the "Wolf" was obliged to do penance on his bare knees, clothed in sackcloth, in the Blackfriars' church at Perth, in the presence of the king his brother, and some of the nobility; and, on engaging to pay a large sum to the Bishop and canons of Moray, in compensation for their loss, he was formally absolved by the Bishop of St Andrews.

This prelate died in the castle of St Andrews, which he had rebuilt, that fortress having been demolished by Sir A. Murray in 1335, as before stated. Fordun, after highly eulogising him, thus sums up his character:—"This censor of morals, this corrector of faults, than whom no one was more severe in punishing, more gentle in admonishing, more forward in assisting, more hospitable in entertaining, or more affable in manners, was broken down by old age, and died in the castle of St Andrews, which he had reconstructed from its foundation; and was honourably interred in the cathedral church, with this inscription on his monument:

> Hic flos ecclesiæ, directa columna, fenestra
> Lucida, thuribulum redolens, campana sonora."

Our ancient chronicler, whom we have so often quoted, but of whom, I regret to say, we must soon take a final leave, thus adverts to the death of his contemporary, Bishop Trail:—

> A thousand four hundyr yearis and ane
> Fra Jesus Chryst had manhood tane,
> The byshop of Sanct Andrewys see
> A lord commendyt of bounty,
> By all vertuous appearand,
> God-lykly hys lyfe leadand,

to destroy and profane whatever was venerable from age, or consecrated by religion; and who yet never had the grace, like "the Wolf," to seek absolution for his sacrilege! He commanded the very lead to be stripped off Elgin cathedral and sold, for the payment of his troops; but, as if by a divine retribution, the vessel in which it was embarked to be conveyed to Holland, sunk on her passage.

Leale and wyse in all counsale,
And cunnand in all governale,
A solemn clerk by grace,
Promotyd in sundry faculties;
In ilkane deed ware and wyse,
And rycht devout in hys servyce,
Master Walter Trail by name.
This lord of commendyt fame
Hys soul yauld to hys Creatoure,
Hys body to hallowed sepulture.
The kyrk of Scotland moaned sare
The loss of that richt gude pillare.

Bishop Keith remarks, that "he was of such excellent worth, that even Buchanan speaks in his praise." Wyntoun enumerates the following donations which he bestowed upon his church:—

—— twa lang coddis[1] of velvet
That on the hygh altar oft are set,
Wyth a-raye a fayre towel,
Wyth a priestis vestment hale,
Wyth tunakil and Dalmatyke,
Albis wyth ornaments to them lyke,
Wyth stole and kerchiefs lyke to tha,
Another chesabil he gave alsua;
Of sylver the haly water vat,
The styck of sylver he gave to that;
An ewar of sylver then gave he;
Of gold bawdekynnys[2] he gave three;
Twa broad ewars of sylver brycht,
And ow'r gilt all weel at rycht:
And twenty cuppil[3] he gave or moe,
To the body of the kyrk also.
Wythouten doute he had done mare,
Had God hym tholed to lyve langare.
Yet other gyftis he gave sere,
That are noucht all now reckoned here.
Thir byshops Williame[4] and Waltere
Honoured their kyrk in this manere;
For this their soulis we commend
Til lastand joy wythouten end.

Bishop Trail's name occurs three times in the Register of the Priory; first, as giving the rector of the parish of Edwy a piece of ground for a manse, the

[1] Cushions.
[2] Bodkins.
[3] Beams, or rafters.
[4] William de Landel.

former site being inconvenient, p. 409; secondly, as witnessing, along with the Duke of Albany, the Bishop of Caithness, and Andrew de Wyntoun, (our chronicler, who was then Prior of Lochleven,) a perambulation between the baronies of Kirkness and Lochore, p. 2; and, thirdly, as deciding upon a complaint brought before him by the same Andrew, for the recovering of tithes due to Lochleven priory from William de Barclay, p. 6.[1]

The waxen impression of Trail's seal has St Andrew on his cross, and himself praying below, with the royal arms on the one side, and his family arms on the other. The circumscription is, "S. Walteri Dei gracia epi. Sti. Andree." The counterseal has the Virgin and child, the family shield, and simply the name, Walterus Trail.

Dempster gives the names of several works of which this bishop was the reputed author, but asserts that they were all burnt by Knox and his followers.

During the foregoing episcopate, the prior of the monastery was Robert of Montrose, (de Monte Rosarum,[2]) who had been originally a canon of the church, and afterwards Prior of Lochleven, and official in the bishop's court at St Andrews. He is stated to have both reformed the discipline of the monastery, and improved its buildings; and in carrying on the repairs of the damage caused by the fire, he finished, at great expense, the new work in the body of the church, as high as the roof. The following account from Fordun, of this man's excellent character and tragical death, may be thought interesting. He was a man of great

[1] In page 15 of the Register, Wyntoun prosecutes the same person "in the parish church of St Leonards within the city of St Andrews," in the year 1414, which is a proof that he was alive in that year.

[2] This is a mere monkish play upon the name, its true derivation being *Mount-ross*, the hill-promontory.

knowledge and eloquence, and a distinguished preacher; an upholder of the ancient discipline, a pattern to the flock in the monastery, and a good shepherd to the people; for he did not despise the people, but instructed them, and rendered to every one his due. He did not flatter the great, nor fear their threats; he did not oppress the poor, but protected them. The errors of those subject to him he did not overlook, but corrected; in all things showing himself respectful to his seniors, mild to his juniors, gentle to his religious brethren, unyielding to the proud and obstinate, condescending to the humble, and tender-hearted to the penitent. This being the case, he could truly adopt the language of the founder of his order, St Augustine, who, in one of his epistles, thus speaks:—"I dare not say that my house is better than the ark of Noah, where one wicked man was found; nor better than Abraham's house, where it is said, 'cast out the bondwoman and her son;' nor better than Isaac's house, concerning whose two sons it is said, 'Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated:' so I confess, that from the time I began to serve God, I have found, that as the best of men are to be met with in monasteries, so they not unfrequently contain the worst." It happened that Robert of Montrose had in his monastery a monk named Thomas Plater, an undisciplined and turbulent man, whom he had often tried, both by threats and promises, but in vain, to bring to a sense of his errors. He considered, nevertheless, that he who connives at another's fault is guilty of it; and that impunity is the mother of insolence, the root of petulance, and the nurse of error. While he was revolving in his mind how he should gain his brother, the latter, instigated by the devil, was plotting his superior's destruction. One evening, (in 1393,) when the prior was alone, and was going up, as usual, from the cloister to the dormitory

for the night, Plater, watching his opportunity, attacked him, and drawing a dagger from under his cloak, mortally wounded him. He survived only three days; and bidding his brethren farewell, slept in the Lord, and was buried in the new chapter-house. The parricide was apprehended as he was trying to make his escape. Two days after the prior's funeral, he was brought forth, clad in a long robe; and after a solemn discourse from Walter Trail the bishop, addressed to the clergy and people, he was thrust bound into perpetual imprisonment. There, partaking scantily of the bread of grief and the water of affliction, he soon died, and was buried in a dunghill.

XXXIV. Thomas Stewart, A.D. 1401–1402. Elect.

This prelate was a son of King Robert II., and Archdeacon of St Andrews; but he was never more than bishop elect; for, owing to the distracted state of the papacy at the time, he was not confirmed, and therefore never consecrated. Fordun calls him, "Modestissimi spiritus vir et columbinæ simplicitatis." Among the last chronicles of the venerable Wyntoun, who was at this time far advanced in years, is his account of this bishop's election:—

When this gude byshop [1] wyth honour
Was dead, and laid in sepulture,
A day for the electioun
Was set, as befel of raisoun.
The fyrst of July in that year,
The chanonis in their chapitere,
By concord electioun,
The archdean chused of Anderstoun.[2]
Thomas Stewart was hys name,
A clerk of commendyt fame.
Intil chanon bachelere
He was made before that year.

[1] Bishop Trail. [2] St Andrews, or Andrew's-town.

This elect then Thomas
To the kyng the bruther was,
And to the Duke of Albany,
That loved hys person tenderly;
And to the Earl of Cathenes
This ilk Thomas bruther was;
And to nobles mony moe
He cousin germayne was also.
Dean Willame Nory, sub-priour,
Of that errand instructour,
Tuk the decreet, and all so fast
Ou'r sea to the court he past.
In Avignon the pope then was,
Haldyn closit in hys palace.
There, of his cardinalis sere
Agayne hym were wyth their powere.
So four year he was and mare,
Haldyn closit in hys palace there.
Mony gret errands were for-thi,
Treated and sped the mare slowly.

In these last lines, there is a reference to the controversy then going on between the rival popes at Rome and Avignon, for the chair of St Peter. I mentioned before, that a grand schism had, at that time, taken place in the papacy. The same dissension was still going on, but under two new popes, who had succeeded the former, namely, Boniface IX. and Benedict XIII. In this quarrel, all the nations of Europe took a part, some of them siding with one, and some with the other. Scotland adhered to Benedict, whose court was at Avignon. France, on the contrary, opposed his pretensions, and carried her opposition so far as to besiege him in his own palace from 1398 to 1403, after which he succeeded in making his escape, and retired to Spain. This is what Wyntoun means by saying,

So four year he was and mare
Haldyn closit in hys palace there.

This state of things, it is easy to conceive, would interfere with the business of the popedom, and cause a delay in the confirmation of Bishop Stewart.

At the time now under our review, a melancholy event occurred in this vicinity, which must here be briefly adverted to. David duke of Rothesay, eldest son of the king, and nephew of our bishop, had abandoned himself to dissipated habits, and was, in consequence, placed under the surveillance of his uncle the Duke of Albany, who treated him with extreme harshness. During the lives of the Queen, Bishop Trail, and Archibald the Grim earl of Douglas, not only was young Rothesay kept in tolerable order, but Albany himself was prevented from treating him with any undue severity. But by this time, these three personages were dead, and with them, says Fordun, had departed the glory and honesty of Scotland. Albany, consequently, no longer under any restraint, gave way to the natural implacability of his temper, and his hatred of his nephew; in which he was the more inclined to indulge, because the latter, and his brother James, (afterwards James I.,) were the only persons that stood between him and the throne. One day, when the young duke was riding near St Andrews, he was seized by order of his uncle, and thrown into the castle of the city; from which, in a few days, he was removed to Falkland, where he soon after died, it is alleged, of starvation, or by some violent means. When the report reached the king, he ordered an investigation to be made into the circumstances, the result of which was favourable to the Duke of Albany, though common report still accused him of the murder.[1] Wyntoun does not breathe a suspicion on the subject, nor even mention the place of Rothesay's death, but, on the contrary, highly eulogises both uncle and nephew. Being a contemporary, he was perhaps afraid to write all he thought or knew concerning so powerful a nobleman as Albany. He acted on the principle which he elsewhere avows,

[1] Lord Hailes' Remarks on the History of Scotland, p. 278.

And in all thyng full suth to say,
Is noucht needful nor speedful aye.

Yet Robert himself, in the letter which he afterwards wrote to Henry IV., recommending his son James to that sovereign's protection, does not scruple to express his belief that the Duke of Rothesay had been murdered by his uncle.[1]

Meantime a new candidate for the bishopric of St Andrews obtruded himself, in the person of an unworthy ecclesiastic of the name of Walter de Danyelstone. This individual is said to have been "Parson of Kincardine in Nile," (Kincardine O'Neil;) and a few years before this, to have, by some means which are not stated, got possession of the almost impregnable fortress of Dumbarton castle. Of the power he thus acquired, he appears to have made no good use, if we may judge from some hints thrown out by Wyntoun:—

Master Walter of Danyelstone,
Of Kincardyn in Nile parsone,
The castell tuk of Dunbartane.
That 'Lithgow grieved in Lothiane;
And sundry other landis sere
Grieved that he ever gat in there.

And further on he speaks of

Wycked deedis mony and fell
By the men used of that castell.

We may gather from this, that Danyelstone, and his men in the castle, did many unlawful things, and in particular plundered the town of Linlithgow, and the adjacent country. To the same effect Fordun says, that he "took and kept possession of Dumbarton, with a large military force, to the great annoyance of the king and the kingdom;" and, drawing a contrast between him and his predecessor, the good Bishop Trail, he applies this couplet to the latter:—

[1] See the whole letter in Hall's Chronicle, p. 37.

O vas virtutis! alimentum, lux tabidorum,
Ægrotos refovens ubere salvifico.

But the following to Danyelstone—

O vitiorum vas! alimentum luxurei,
Trux, ægros reprimens verbere sulphureo.

Both the king, and his brother of Albany, who was the chief manager of the affairs of the kingdom, were anxious to get this important fortress out of the hands of Danyelstone, and, with this view, set on foot a treaty with him; but when they came to settle the terms, it was found that he would resign it only on the condition of being made Bishop of St Andrews. This was no doubt an unreasonable, uncanonical, and even simonaical proposal; but, owing to the Duke's anxiety to get possession of the castle, the too compliant temper of the bishop-elect as well as of the prior and canons, and the papal schism which at this time gave a sort of impunity to all kinds of ecclesiastical irregularities, the measure was agreed to, and effected.

Walter de Danyelstone yet then
The castell held of Dunbartane.
But by treaty, nevertheless,
He granted, and contented was,
To leave his purpose, gif that he
Mycht Byshop of Sanct Andrewys be.
Then came the Duke of Albany
And treated intil Abernethy
Wyth hys brother, then elyte;
Where-through hys bruther gave up quyte
All title and all claim of rycht
That he then had, or he have mycht,
Til that state of promotioun
By the foresaid electioun.
When thus the archdene had done,
The duke treated the priore soon
The chanonis to call to chapiter
Upon a day, and there them gar
Make a new electioun,
In way of compromissioun.

Bishop Stewart, having thus given up his election in favour of Danyelstone, returned to his former situ-

ation of archdeacon; for we find him mentioned in that capacity in the Register of the Priory, under date 1405, as renting from the then prior and canons the lands of Balgove, with its *salina* and meadows, p. 422.

XXXV. Walter de Danyelstone, a.d. 1402. Elect.

When matters had so far proceeded as to create a vacancy in the bishopric, the next step was the election of Danyelstone, which was agreed to by the prior and canons more from necessity than choice, and defended on no better ground than that of expediency. But, as we have no account of this proceeding, except what Wyntoun has given us, I can do no more than transcribe his brief chronicle of the fact. If this episcopate were a discreditable one, it was happily a short one.

This Master Walter was chosen soon
Agayne conscience of mony men;
But like it was to staunch then
Wycked deedis mony and fell
By the men used of that castell.
Yet by this electioun
He did all ministratioun
In jurisdictioun spirituale
And in all things temporale,
All that whyle, rycht as he
Had had lauchful authority;
Pretendand aye for hys reasoun,
Nihil de electione.
Nihil sua happenyt for to be;
Soon after at the Yule died he.
So little mare than half a year
Lastit he in his powere.[1]

[1] Bishop Keith passes over this bishop entirely, merely remarking, "'Tis said that the rents of the bishopric, during the vacancy, were bestowed by the king upon Walter de Danyelstone, in recompense for the castle of Dumbarton, which he enjoyed heritably." But Wyntoun, who was a contemporary, and whose "Chronicle" Keith had probably not examined, (as it was not then printed, and is not easily read in the original,) undoubtedly gives the true account.

James Bisset, licentiate in decrees, was prior of the monastery at this time, whom I may mention here, though he did not die till A.D. 1416. Fordun, or rather his continuator, speaks of him as if he had known him personally, and in a strain of the highest panegyric; though it is not always easy to comprehend his barbarous latinity, nor, when we do, can we altogether admire his style.

"This Bisset," he says, "was nephew of the most religious father Thomas Bisset, a former prior of the same monastery, whose good conduct he so closely imitated, that he was second to none of his predecessors. In carrying on the repairs of the damage caused by the late fire, he completed the roofing of the nave of the cathedral and of the porch, fitted up the choir with stalls, and finished the quadrangle of the cloister. He furnished the whole monastery with new granaries, mills, calefactories (ustrinas,) piggeries, barns, and stables; and provided the two apartments of the guest-hall with pillars and glass windows. He paved the exterior and interior courts of the monastery; and supplied its mensal churches, as well as all the other churches dependent upon it, with vestries, robes for the priests, and other useful ornaments. He was like a shoot of a true vine which grows into a choice tree, and yields, by its abundant fruit, an odour pleasant to God and to man. Moreover, he was humble and benignant above all men: to his brethren patient, to the poor compassionate, and that in spiritual as well as temporal things. To him it was an object of solicitude that the altars should shine, the lights be brilliant, the priests competent for their duties, the canons becoming in their behaviour, the vessels and vestments clean and pure, and all the services of the monastery regularly performed,—persuaded that in these things lay the honour of God and of his house,

the true signification of things sacred, the proper employment of the priests, the devotion of the people, and the edification of all. Whatever he could save out of the annual revenues of the monastery, he devoted to the improvement of the cathedral, the rites of hospitality, or the use of the poor. Besides this, he vigorously sustained several contests, as well distant as domestic, in which he was obliged to take a part for the protection of his monastery. Who that was adorned with so many virtues would not swell with pride? Yet he was humble; and on the foundation of humility he rose to the summit of charity. Who was weak, and he was not weak? who was offended, and he burned not? In short, he was all things to all the brethren, that he might contribute to the salvation of all. This prior was tall of stature, sedate in manners, and circumspect in all things. And, not to enumerate his other virtues, he was grave in conversation, prudent, affable, and forgiving. He loved the humble and checked the proud. He was not fractious in his deeds, nor loose in his behaviour, nor petulant in his words; but you beheld in him the image and personification of probity. But why should I dwell on these particulars? For even the holy church still proclaims, though I were not to mention, his sound judgment, his fertile genius, his retentive memory, his flowing eloquence, and his laudable actions How great and good a man he was, let the reader of this learn from the surviving canons, and others who knew him during his life. And, doubtless, of him will the canons tell their younger brethren, that the generation to come may know and put their trust in the Lord, and not forget the works of their prior, but diligently search them out. Many of his disciples, imbued with his spirit, attained the height of virtue, and, after his death, were called to the office of

pastors or fathers: one of whom became Bishop of Ross; two, Abbots of Scone and Inchcolm respectively; and three were successively Priors of Monymusk. Nor need this be wondered at, since, by direction of this prior, two of his canons were obliged to be licentiates in decrees; five, bachelors in decrees; and two, masters in theology; one of whom afterwards succeeded him in the priorate. Then it was that the cloistered garden of St Andrews, exposed to the genial influences of the south, as much abounded with men illustrious for their virtues, as it was productive of natural flowers. The monastic union flourished in the religious ceremonies, the canonical plant was strengthened by the cares of a Martha, and seraphic zeal overflowed in theological learning. In the first of these, peace and harmony of manners; in the second, peace and a due proportion of study; in the third, peace and progress of merit, sent up a melody pleasing to God and to man. Many other good deeds did this prior perform during his life; for he redeemed the monastic lands which had been mortgaged after the great fire of the cathedral, and left the monastery not only free from debt, but with a plentiful store of iron, lead, planks, timber, coal (bituminis,) salt, and gold; and a full concourse of brethren. He departed this life, at a good old age, in the prior's house, on the morrow of the nativity of St John Baptist, in the year 1416. He was prior twenty-three years, and was buried with his brethren in the new chapter-house.[1] He will

[1] It is stated of the Abbots of Melrose that, after their death, they lay in state for three days, in the centre of the choir of their church, arrayed in their pontifical robes; after which, they were interred with their crosier, mitre, gloves, ring, sandals, and a silver chalice on their breasts. As the Priors of St Andrews were superior in rank to the Abbots of Melrose, it is more than probable that the same ceremonies were observed at their funerals. But the very flooring of the chapter-house here has been torn up, and, in all likelihood, the graves rifled of their valuable contents!

receive, it is believed, a reward at the resurrection of the just; for it is not probable that the goodness of the great Creator will pass by *his* religious labours who, by the abundance of his benevolence, surpassed the expectations of those who were petitioners to him. The following is the epitaph on his tomb:—

Hic Jacobita fulgens velut gemma polita
In claustri vita vixit velut vir hermita."

This prior's name is found only twice in the Register of the Priory, viz., in the instrument of perambulation, already mentioned, p. 188, as performed in the presence of Bishop Trail. Prior Bisset is there stated to have been absent at the time on business at Rome, (in curia Romana tunc agenti,) p. 2. He is mentioned again, p. 421, as engaging, for himself and canons, to pay Thomas prior of Candida Casa £20 Scots, failing which, their goods might be distrained.

XXXVI. Henry Wardlaw, A.D. 1403–1440.

On the death of Danyelstone, the prior and canons postulated, for his successor, Gilbert of Greenlaw bishop of Aberdeen and Chancellor of Scotland, and sent Dean Nory a second time to Avignon, to get the pope's consent to his election. This, however, for reasons which do not appear, Benedict XIII. refused, and bestowed the vacant see on Henry Wardlaw precentor of Glasgow, doctor of canon law, and nephew of the cardinal of that name. But as this is the last quotation but one which we shall be able to make from Wyntoun, I must be again excused for giving his narrative in his own simple style:—

When of these electiouns
Twa fell sic cassatiouns,[1]

[1] This word seems here used in the sense of happening or falling out, (*cado.*) The meaning is, that as the two preceding elections

As before ye heard me say,
The college after set a day
To do their part in that matere.
They gadryt intil chapitere,
And thoucht that postulatioun
Was best for that provisioun.
To postule they delyveryt[1] than
A commendyt famous man,
Master Gilbert of Greenlaw, he
Then byshop of Abirdenys see,
And chancelore of Scotland;
He was bath famous and plesand.
On this matter all so fast,
Again dean Williame Nory past
To the court. Or he there come
The pope was intil mare freedome
Than before that tyme was he.
Yet that errand wold noucht be
Sped, for oucht that he mycht do,
Nor all the help he had thereto.
Master Henry of Wardlaw,
That like til vertue was to draw,
Chantour that tyme of Glasgow,
Commendyt of all-kyn gude vertue,
The pope had in affectioun
Bath for hys fame and this reasoun;
Hys eyme[2] was byshop of Glasgow
Before, and famous of vertue,
A theologue solemn was he
Kend, and known of gret bounty;
And syne was he priest cardinal.
So by this reasoun special,
Of the thretteend Bennet pope,
This Master Henry was byshop
Of Sanct Andrewys with honour;
Of canon he was then doctour.

The powerful Earl of Northumberland, having lost his son at the battle of Shrewsbury, and being banished from England by Henry IV., arrived at St Andrews to pay Bishop Wardlaw a visit, in the first year of his episcopate, by whom he was honourably and hospitably entertained.

The auld erle of Northumberland
Was hard pressed that tyme in Ingland:

had proved unfortunate, the canons now resolved to postulate a consecrated bishop.

[1] They determined after deliberating, *delibero*. [2] Uncle.

A whyle in France, in Scotland a whyle,
That lord was traveland in exyle ;
And at the last in Scotland
He delyverit[1] to be dwelland.
The byshop of Sanct Andrewys see,
Then Master Henry called was he,
Ressaved that erle in hys castell,
And procured hym therein rycht well
Wyth gret honour and bounty.

The Earl brought with him his grandson Henry Percy, and when he departed, left him under the charge of the bishop. About the same time, Robert III., anxious for the safety of his only surviving son, James, more especially after the mysterious death of his eldest son, resolved to place him under the same guardianship; and here he accordingly remained for about two years, in company with young Percy. But at length, his father, not deeming him altogether safe from danger, even under the watchful superintendence of Wardlaw, and in the shelter of his strong castle, determined on sending him to the court of his ally Charles VI. of France. On his passage he had the misfortune, as is well known, to be captured by the English, and sent as a prisoner to London; though a truce betwixt the two nations had not expired, and though his father had written an affecting letter to the King of England with his own hand, entreating him, in the event of such an accident befalling his son, to allow him to prosecute his voyage.

But we must proceed to notice an important occurrence which took place at St Andrews during the young prince's imprisonment in England. This was the establishment of the university, of which Bishop Wardlaw has the honour of being the founder and the promoter. But we must allow Mr Tytler, the modern historian of Scotland, to give his eloquent description

[1] Determined.

of this auspicious event :—"It is necessary here to interrupt the narrative for a moment, in order to fix our attention upon a spectacle which, amid the gloomy pictures of foreign or domestic wars, offers a refreshing and pleasing resting-place to the mind. This was the establishment of the university of St Andrews, by Henry Wardlaw the bishop of that see, to whom belongs the unfading honour of being the founder of the first university in Scotland, the father of the infant literature of his country. Before this time, the generosity of the Lady Devorguil, the wife of John Baliol, had established Baliol college in Oxford, in the end of the thirteenth century; and we have seen the munificence of a Scottish prelate, the Bishop of Moray, distinguishing itself by the institution of the Scots college in Paris, in 1326. But it was reserved for the enlightened spirit of Wardlaw to render unnecessary the distant emigration of our Scottish youth to these and other foreign seminaries, by opening the wells of learning and education at home; and in addition to the various schools which were connected with the monasteries, by conferring upon his country the distinction of a university, protected by papal sanction, and devoted to the cultivation of what was then esteemed the higher branches of science and philosophy.—On the 3d of February 1413, Henry Ogilvy master of Arts, made his entry into the city, bearing the papal bulls which endowed the infant seminary with the high and important privileges of a university: and his arrival was welcomed by the ringing of bells from the steeples, and the tumultuous joy of all classes of the inhabitants. On the following day, being Sunday, a solemn convocation of the clergy was held in the refectory; and the papal bulls having been read in the presence of the bishop, the chancellor of the university, they proceeded in procession to the high altar, where

Te Deum was sung by the whole assembly; the bishops, priors, and other dignitaries, being arrayed in their richest canonicals, whilst four hundred clerks, besides novices and lay brothers, and an immense number of spectators, bent down before the high altar in gratitude and adoration. High mass was then celebrated; and when the service was concluded, the remainder of the day was devoted to mirth and festivity. In the evening, bonfires in the streets, peals of bells and musical instruments, processions of the clergy, and joyful assemblies of the people indulging in the song, the dance, and the wine cup, succeeded to the graver ceremonies of the morning; and the event was welcomed by a boisterous enthusiasm, more befitting the brilliant triumphs of war than the quiet and noiseless conquests of science and philosophy."

We have still the foundation-charter of the university, dated 1411, in which the bishop fixes its constitution, settles its discipline, confers various privileges upon its professors and members; and invests the government of it in the rector, subject to an appeal to himself and his successors, whom he creates its perpetual chancellors. We have also the confirmation of the bishop's charter by James I., dated Perth, 1432.[1]

Bishop Wardlaw's example was not long in being followed by some others of the Scottish prelates; for in 1452 Bishop Turnbull founded the university of Glasgow; in four years after, Bishop Kennedy, as we shall see in the next episcopate, built and endowed the college of St Salvator in St Andrews; and at the end of the same century, Bishop Elphinstone instituted the university of Aberdeen. Yet we are not to suppose that Scotland was destitute of schools of learning and education before the establishment of her universities.

[1] See Appendix I. 4, 9; and vol. ii. Chap. viii. On the University.

In the Register of the priory of St Andrews, which I have so often referred to, we meet with an accidental reference to the schools of Abernethy, in Fife, so early as the eleventh century. In that volume, p. 115, Edelradus, son of Malcolm III., grants to the monks of Lochleven a piece of land called Admore, among the witnesses to which we find "Berbeadh rector of the schools of Abernethy." And in another document in the same work, p. 316, which refers to the beginning of the thirteenth century, there is mention made of "Master Patrick, master of the schools of St Andrews, and the poor scholars of the same city," who, it would appear, had an endowment consisting of certain rents and kane, payable to them from lands in the neighbourhood. This was two hundred years before the foundation of the university, and, no doubt, formed the *nucleus* of that institution. In truth, there were few monasteries in Scotland which had not a school of some kind attached to them, and of which the monks were the teachers, or, at least, the superintendants. They who, at that early period, wanted a university education, generally went to Oxford or Cambridge. In the Rotuli Scotiæ are many safe-conducts granted to Scottish students to enable them to proceed in safety to those seats of learning.[1]

The University of St Andrews, or *Studium Generale* as it was then called, was set on foot by authority of the bulls of Benedict XIII., who had by this time established his court at Paniscola in Arragon, (being himself a Spaniard,) and was still carrying on his claim to the popedom. There are six bulls of this pontiff preserved among the university charters. They are all dated in 1413, and state, that at the instance of James I., Bishop Wardlaw, the Prior, Archdeacon,

[1] Appendix XXVI.

and conventual chapter of St Andrews, his holiness had consented to institute the said studium "for the study of theology, canon and civil law, arts, medicine, and other lawful faculties;" empowering it to confer degrees, exempting its professors from residence on their benefices, as also from the payment of taxes, and appointing visiters to inspect it.[1]

At the period in question, there were no less than three popes contending for the chair of St Peter, namely, John XXIII. at Rome, Gregory XII. at Rimini, and the said Benedict in Spain, which country, as well as Scotland, favoured the latter's pretensions. Owing to this disagreement, the general council of Constance met in the year 1414, and after decreeing that a general council of the Catholic church is superior to a pope, they determined that all the three above-named popes should be deposed, and a new one elected in their place. This was acted upon accordingly. Gregory resigned, John was imprisoned, but Benedict held out for seven years after this decision; during part of which time, the Scottish bishops and the Duke of Albany, (Governor of Scotland during the captivity of James I.,) adhered to him. At length, in 1416, the council of Constance sent the Abbot of Pontiniac, to persuade the Scots to withdraw their obedience from Benedict, and to acknowledge the new pope, Martin V. This question was debated in a general assembly of the church in Perth. The abbot made an eloquent speech in favour of Martin, entreating his audience to acknowledge him, and thus put an end to the unhappy schism which had so long distracted the Church. On the other hand, letters were read from Benedict himself, complimenting the Scots for their long fidelity to him; reminding them of their obligations

[1] Appendix I. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

to him as to their university; reprobating the council of Constance as unlawful, because constituted without his sanction; and, finally, contending that he alone was the legitimate successor of St Peter. His cause was defended by friar Robert Harding, an English monk, who delivered a long address to the assembly in support of it. But John Fogo a monk of Melrose, John Elwolde rector of the university, and other celebrated divines belonging to it, having confuted the friar's arguments, the assembly agreed in the end to comply with the desire of the general council. Fordun says, "the whole university of St Andrews rose up against Harding;" which seems remarkable, considering that, only a few years before, they owed their constitution to the bulls of Benedict. But the stream had turned against the ex-pontiff, and they saw that it would be in vain for them to resist it. All Christendom ultimately acquiesced in this determination, and Benedict of Avignon was erased from the list of the popes. The real Benedict XIII. did not reign till the eighteenth century.

"In the year 1411," says Boethius, "began the university of St Andrews, and attracted to it the most learned men as its professors,—viz. Lawrence of Lindores, abbot of Scone, and professor of laws; Richard Cornwall, doctor of decrees, and archdeacon of Lothian; William Stephen, afterwards Bishop of Dunblane; John Litster canon of St Andrews, John Schives official, and John Shevez archdeacon of the same; in all, thirteen doctors of theology, and eight doctors of decrees, besides others.[1] Nor was there wanting a corresponding auditory; for all who thirsted for literature resorted to the university from every quarter, especially after the return of King James from Eng-

[1] Lawrence of Lindores is said to have lectured on the four books of the Sentences by Peter de Lombardy.

land, who encouraged learned men to come to him, by bestowing upon them the most ample church preferment."

The university did not at first consist of any particular building exclusively appropriated for its use, but had rooms belonging to it in different parts of the city, as the generosity of individuals prompted them to give them up for the purposes of instruction. We have a charter of Bishop Wardlaw, dated 1430, in which he grants a particular tenement in the city, "in pure and perpetual charity, &c., to the end that the masters and regents of the faculty of arts, may therein hold, if need be, their grammatical schools, or may serve as halls or chambers for the students, or for the construction and repair of the same."[1] The professors had no remuneration for their services, either from fixed endowments, or from fees; but being all of the order of the priesthood, they enjoyed church benefices, from residence on which they were specially exempted. They were likewise relieved from all burdens and taxes, whether personal or pecuniary.

The Rotuli Scotiæ makes mention of Bishop Wardlaw on three different occasions. It contains a safe-conduct for him and others in 1411, and again in 1416, for proceeding to England to negotiate a truce with that country; and in the treaty for the liberation of James I., he is named among the Scottish bishops and nobles who were parties to that transaction.

In the year 1424, James I. returned from England, where, though a captive, he had received an excellent education, and acquired a taste for poetry and literature. He had also taken for his queen the Lady Jane Beaufort, both of whom were crowned at Scone by his old preceptor Wardlaw, in the presence of the

[1] See Appendix I., 8.

prelates, and nobles of Scotland. One of his first cares, after this, was to sanction and encourage the infant university. From the Continental universities he invited many learned theologians, and particularly, it is added, some Carthusian monks, to assist in following up his undertaking. The public disputations of the students he countenanced with his presence, and ordered that the professors should recommend none for ecclesiastical preferment but such as were skilful in their several faculties, as well as virtuous in their lives. He likewise enacted, that all commencing masters of arts should swear to defend the Church against her enemies, and particularly against all adherents of the heretical sect then denominated Lollards.

It is proper to state here, that two persons suffered death for alleged heresy, in the diocese of St Andrews during the episcopate of Bishop Wardlaw. "His memorie," says Martine, "is sullied by the death of John Resby and Paul Craw, who were condemned and burnt for some opinions derogatory to the papacie." Resby was, strictly speaking, the proto-martyr of Scotland, and not Patrick Hamilton, as is usually represented. He was burnt at Perth, in the year 1407. Fordun says of him, that "he was reckoned a famous preacher by the simple people; but that he interspersed many dangerous conclusions in his discourses, especially that the pope is not Christ's vicar upon earth, and that no one can be Christ's vicar, if he be a bad man." Craw was a Bohemian physician, and a disciple of Huss and Wickliff. He had come to St Andrews to practise professionally, and took the opportunity of disseminating his opinions, which he was able to confirm by his readiness in quoting Scripture. Bishop Lesley thus mentions the fact. "Those who favoured the Wickliffian heresy in Bohemia, sent one Paul Craw into

Scotland to disseminate it here. He quickly obeyed these orders, as if he had been an apostle: and coming to St Andrews, he scattered his poison secretly in the university. In a short time, his designs being discovered, he was reasoned with by some learned men. But heresy had taken such firm hold of his mind, that neither the force of argument, nor the authority of antiquity, nor the testimony of the Fathers of the Church, nor the true sense of holy Scripture, could move him. He was therefore committed to the flames, to prevent the evil from spreading. The abbacy of Melrose was afterwards procured from the king for John Fogo, professor of theology, because he had been zealous in the prosecution of this affair." Fordun says of Craw, that those who sent him from Bohemia denied the doctrines of purgatory, pilgrimages, a separate order of the priesthood, and the resurrection of the body, (articulum de resurrectione mortuorum;) and contended for a community of wives, and the subjection of the spiritual to the temporal power.[1] A modern, and perhaps more impartial testimony,[2] affirms of the Lollards generally, that they "bore a close resemblance to the Puritans of Elizabeth's reign; a moroseness that proscribed all cheerful amusements, an uncharitable malignity that made no distinction in condemning the established clergy, and a narrow prejudice that applied the rules of the Jewish law to modern institutions. Some of their principles were far more dangerous to the good order of society, and cannot justly be ascribed to the Puritans." Craw suffered in this city, in 1432. While being burnt, a brass ball was put into his mouth, to prevent his addressing the people. We must remember that, in those days, whosoever put a heretic to death, believed he was

[1] Lib. xvi. cap. 20.

[2] Hallam, vol. iii. p. 475.

doing God service. This belief lasted till long after the time of Wardlaw, and even till after the Reformation itself; and if it do not appear now, it is not because human nature is changed, but because opinions have taken a new direction, and vices are diverted into other channels. Even our kind-hearted chronicler Wyntoun, whom we have so often quoted with approbation, mentions it as one among the many good qualities which he ascribes to the Duke of Albany, that

> He was a constant Catholike;
> All Lollard he hated and heretike.

At the same time it is right to add, in justice to Wardlaw, that though he must have sanctioned the execution of Resby and Craw, the chief instigator was Lawrence of Lindores, the pope's Inquisitor for Scotland, and who, we have already seen, was one of the professors in the new university. Indeed, we may remark, concerning *all* the St Andrews martyrs, that, as we shall discover in the sequel, they suffered death under the administration, and with the concurrence, of the very prelates who founded or endowed our colleges; namely, Bishop Wardlaw, and Archbishops J. Beaton, D. Beaton, and Hamilton. To treat the memory of these prelates fairly, therefore, we ought to balance their lettered liberality against their religious intolerance.[1] But I have another observation to

[1] A monument is in the course of being erected here in honour of the St Andrews martyrs. In all cases of this kind, where one party has suffered, and another inflicted suffering, whatever keeps alive the recollection of the transaction, must, of course, tell as much against the latter as in favour of the former. The projected monument, therefore, will be commemorative of the intolerance of the very prelates who founded and endowed our colleges. I waive all consideration of the merits or demerits of the parties implicated, which I will suppose to be in exact accordance with the popular belief. But, under the circumstances, would it not be better to let matters rest as they are? or better still, perhaps, to put up the monument in memory of those men from whose benefactions so many generations of our countrymen have reaped, and may yet reap, the most solid advantages?

make concerning the death of Craw. His fate was undoubtedly cruel and indefensible; and yet he could have expected nothing else. There was unquestionably a need of reformation; but it does not appear what claim an unauthorized and irresponsible layman like him had, to put himself forward as the promoter of one. The country, besides, was not ripe for it; and the system he would have introduced, if, indeed, he had any system at all, was clogged with errors and imperfections scarcely less dangerous than those which he would have removed. In short, he was rather prepared to pull down error than to establish truth. There can be no greater mistake than for men to attempt an extensive reformation, either in religion or politics, unless they are invested with some public character; are fully competent for the task; see their way clearly before them; and are prepared with a well-digested and approved system to substitute for the one which they are anxious to subvert. Without these precautions, reform, instead of being what its name imports, will become nothing more than a substitution of one set of evils for another.

Before closing this episcopate, it ought to be recorded of our bishop, that he has the credit of having built the handsome bridge over the river Eden, four miles from St Andrews, which, at the time, was reckoned the finest in Scotland, except those at Aberdeen and Glasgow. The fact of its having been constructed by Wardlaw, rests on the authority of Martine, Spotswood, and others, who, however, do not inform us whence they derived their information. But it ought to be known, that on two of the buttresses, and on the keystone of one of the arches of this bridge, are three coats of arms. That on the arch is so much effaced, that nothing can be distinguished except the mitre-crest above the shield, and a small scroll hanging down

on each side of it. But the two on the buttresses are the well-known arms of Archbishop James Beaton, whose initials are at the side of the shield.[1] His episcopate extended from A.D. 1522 till 1539. This may perhaps make it a matter of doubt whether Wardlaw or Beaton were the original constructor of the Gare Bridge.[2] The first may have built it, the second rebuilt it of more suitable dimensions; though it is still too narrow to allow of two carriages passing.

This bishop died in the castle of St Andrews, and was buried, "more honourably than his predecessors, in the cathedral church, in the wall betwixt the choir and Our Lady's chapel." But we have no longer a Wyntoun to record his virtues, and to send his "spyrit intil paradise;" for our venerable chronicler had himself gone the way of all flesh, about twenty years before. Fordun gives a somewhat long anagrammic encomium on his memory, in awkward Latin rhymes, the point of which it would be very difficult to convey in a translation.[3]

Martine tells us, that Wardlaw "was ane excellent man, and repressed many disorders which had crept in among the clergie, and was extremely addicted to

[1] These arms cannot be examined except by taking a boat and sailing as near to them as possible. They are all three on what appears to be the oldest part of the bridge.

[2] There is a family of the name of Wan who still have a few acres of land near this bridge, which were granted to their ancestors by the Bishops of St Andrews, on condition of their performing the twofold office of keeping the bridge, and acting as *doomster* to the bishop's court of regality. In former times, a chain was stretched across the bridge, which it was the duty of the keeper to remove, in order to allow the horses or carriages of the gentry to pass over; the carts of the commonalty being obliged to ford the stream at low tide. In his judicial capacity, the doomster was required, by his charter, to yield all due obedience to the seneschal of the bishop, and both to pronounce and execute the *doom* or sentence of his court. The proper name of the bridge, we may observe, is *Gare*, not Guard, as it is commonly called. *Gare*, in Gaelic, signifies a fishing station: hence we have Gare-loch, the Garry, Yare or Gare, &c.

[3] Lib. vi. cap. 47.

hospitalitie." The following anecdote is told as an instance of this virtue. His servants complained to him of the number of persons who came to partake of his bounty, and wished him to restrict his invitations. "Well," said the bishop, "I will give you a list of those I wish you to provide for: first of all, there is Fife; next Angus—" This was enough. The servants immediately abandoned the design of limiting the generosity of their master. But, though hospitable, he was a friend to temperance and sobriety; of which Boethius has given us an example in an excellent speech which he addressed to the king, in a parliament held at Perth, against luxury, which was then beginning to gain ground in Scotland, in consequence of the effeminate habits which James, and the English nobility who accompanied him, had brought from the south. The following is the speech. After commending the king for the excellence and impartial administration of his laws, he proceeds thus:—"Yet there is one corrupt usage crept in of late, and increasing so rapidly, that if remedy be not had in time, all other advantages will be of no avail; and that is, such superfluity in eating and drinking, in imitation of the English, as both injures the health and wastes the substance. Nothing can be more opposed to the ancient and laudable hardihood of the Scottish people, than the new delicacies, the variety of dishes, and the intemperate use of the same, which is lately come in among us. Some apology may be made for the English, who have long been habituated to these luxuries, and use them with more moderation than our people do; but we are especially to blame, who have so quickly yielded to this temptation; and of which the fruits already appear in the excess, sloth, lust, effeminacy, and improvidence, which prevail among so many. For, if temperance be the nourisher of all virtue, intemperance

must be the promoter of all vice. If, therefore, it will please your highness to show your accustomed wisdom in repressing this evil, you will be doing that which is highly meritorious in the sight of God, and no less profitable to all your subjects."

The effect of this speech is said to have been, in respect to dress, that "the immoderate use of pearls was checked; only women being permitted to wear a small carcanet of them about their necks; costly furs and ermines were wholly forbidden; together with the abuse of gold and silver lace. Penalties were not only imposed upon the wearers but on the workmen who should make or sell them. Excessive expense in banqueting was restrained, and dainties banished from the tables of epicures, with jesters and buffoons."[1]

In the Register of the Priory, Wardlaw's name occurs four times. Robert III. confers on him and his successors the "great custom" on wool, skins, leather, fish, &c., together with other like privileges, p. 414; he also grants to them the whole custom and cocket-duty of St Andrews, of which, hitherto, they had received a part only, p. 416. Andrew de Wyntoun, our chronicler, petitions the bishop for redress against William de Berkley, p. 19.; and lastly, the bishop endows an additional prebendary in the royal chapel of St Mary, (Kirkheugh,) with the parish church of Feteresso, reserving to himself and successors the patronage of the same, p. 407. One of the Dunmylne charters, No. 29, informs us that this bishop granted to the monks of Balmerino, the privilege of a baptistery in the chapel of St Alus, for administering the sacraments of the church to the persons in its vicinity. Among the town charters is one containing a grant by Wardlaw, to the magistrates of the city, of

[1] Drummond's History of the Reign of James I., p. 18.

a piece of ground adjoining to the parish church, for the express purpose of enlarging the burying-ground, which had been found too small. This proves there was a cemetery attached to that church before the Reformation. The bishop stipulates, in return, that the chaplains and choristers of the church shall perform an annual mass for his soul. The document is dated in 1430.

During the foregoing episcopate, there were three priors of the monastery elected, though only one of them was confirmed in the office. But before giving some account of them, I may mention a fatal accident which happened in 1409 to Thomas de Cupro, sub-prior of the monastery and a licentiate in decrees. "On St Kentigern's day in that year, there arose a tremendous storm, which tore up trees, threw down churches and houses, and caused numerous shipwrecks. It struck the south gable of the great church of the monastery, [the cathedral,] whereby some large stones were loosened, which, falling down and perforating the dormitory and chapter-house, struck the said Thomas, and so dreadfully bruised his shoulders and legs, that he died a few days after."[1]

After the death of Prior James Bisset in 1416, William de Camera, the sub-prior, was chosen, *per viam Sancti Spiritus*, to succeed him, "honestissima et benignissima persona." On his way either to or from the pope, to whom he had gone for confirmation, he was taken ill at Bruges, where he died, and was buried in the church of St Giles in that city, before the altar of St Andrew the Apostle. The "venerable and religious John Lyster, licentiate in decrees," happened to be with the said William when he died. Immediately he set off for Spain, where Benedict

[1] Fordun, lib. xv., cap. 21.

XIII. held his court, (though by this time he had been deposed from the pontificate,) and easily obtained from him bulls of confirmation to the priorate. But in the meantime, James Haldenstone, "magister in sacra pagina, vir eloquentissimus et doctus," was at Rome, attached to an embassy at that court, sent from the Duke of Albany to Martin V. By this pope, who was now recognised as such by all Christendom, Haldenstone was nominated to the priorate of St Andrews, and his appointment confirmed on his return home, by the canons as well as by the three Estates of the realm. This was in the year 1418. In 1425, he returned to Rome as one of several ambassadors who were sent there by James I.[1] "After ruling his monastery wisely for twenty-four years," says the continuator of Fordun, "he died on the 18th July, 1443, and was honourably interred in the north wall of the Lady Chapel of the cathedral church, with this epitaph, (which affords a curious specimen of monkish taste):—

Qui docui mores, mundi vitare favores,
Inter doctores sacros sortitus honores,
Vermibus hic donor; et sic ostendere conor,
Quod sicut ponor, ponitur omnis honor.

This prior was a man of middling stature, of a cheerful and rubicund countenance, courteous, and fair; severe in correcting, mild in reproving, affable in manners, and prone to compassion; for he was most bountiful to the poor and needy, wherein, as some allege, he was more swayed by ostentatious than charitable motives. But let them beware how they judge rashly; for I know that he gave liberally to the indigent. Nor did he inquire particularly to whom he gave; knowing that God does not so much require that he should be

[1] Rotuli Scotiæ, vol. ii. p. 253.

deserving who asks, as that he should be charitable who gives. He was a hospitable landlord; and those whom he could not satisfy with delicacies, he entertained with *panis Christi*, and a hearty welcome. The east gable of the cathedral church he altered by substituting the present large window for three smaller ones.[1] He adorned the interior, as well with carved stalls, as with the images of the saints. The nave, which before had been covered in by James Bisset, his predecessor of good memory, but was still bare and unfurnished, he beautified throughout with glass windows and polished pavement; as also by supplying altars, images, and ornaments. He furnished the vestry with relics at great expense, repaired the former ones, and erected presses for containing them. The whole choir of the church, the two transepts, two sides of the square cloister, and the entrance to the chapter-house, he laid with polished pavement. He, in a great measure, reconstructed the handsome palace (pulchrum et spectabile palatium) within the court of the prior's hospitium, the oratory and its hall; as also the farmsteadings belonging to the monastery, namely, Balony, Pilmore, Segie, and Kinnimoth. By his influence with Pope Martin V. and King James, he procured for himself and successors the privilege of wearing the mitre, ring, pastoral staff, and other pontifical insignia, in parliaments, councils, synods, and all public assemblies in Scotland.[2] He amplified the divine service in the celebration of mass in the chapel of Our Lady. In the faculty of divinity he eminently excelled; and as Dean of Theology, installed the graduates of the university. As Inquisitor, he sharply reproved and confuted heretics and Lollards. Being honorary chaplain to the pope, and collector of annates for

[1] The traces of the three former windows may yet be perceived.
[2] See Pope Martin V.'s bull to this effect, Appendix VI. 412.

Scotland in his behalf, he undertook a journey to Rome at an advanced age. In his days, William Bonar vicar of St Andrews, completed the altar and crucifix in the nave of the church, with its solid throne and splendid images; and sub-prior William de Ballochy improved the sleeping-places in the dormitory. Finally, at the time his predecessor William de Camera was prior, Haldenstone, who was then sub-prior, renewed the flooring of the refectory,—on account of all which, may his soul and theirs enjoy everlasting rest. Amen."

This prior's name occurs frequently in the Register; but I need only mention two instances. In the year 1434, he and his canons let to Walter Monypenny, the farm of Balrymont-Easter, for nine years, for seven marks Scots yearly, p. 423. Again, in the year 1438, there is an account of a process conducted by him and his canons, against James de Kinninmond, in the presence of certain *nobiles viri*, both religious and civil. The said James loses his suit, and is desired to be obedient for the future to his superiors, the prior and canons. This is the last document in the Register in point of order, though not of the latest date. A Dennylne paper, No. 54, furnishes us with a protest on the part of this prior, dated 1431, against the building of a parish church in Cupar, which the burgesses of that town had begun to erect, contrary to the consent of the Prior of St Andrews, their lawful patron.

XXXVII. James Kennedy, A.D. 1440–1466.

This eminent prelate had been Bishop of Dunkeld before being translated to this see; and was the *last bishop* of St Andrews, as his successor and uterine brother was its *first archbishop*. He was grandson of

Robert III.; but though distinguished by his rank, he was yet more so by his zeal in the discharge of his episcopal duties. A modern historian thus touches upon some of the leading features of his character, and events of his life:—"In him the country lost the only statesman who possessed sufficient firmness, ability, and integrity, to direct the counsels of Government. He was, indeed, in many respects, a remarkable man: a pious and conscientious churchman, whose charity was munificent, active, and discriminating; and whose religion was as little tinged with bigotry and superstition as the times in which he lived would allow. His zeal for the true interests of literature and science was another prominent and admirable feature in his character, of which he left a noble monument in St Salvator's college at St Andrews, which was founded by him in 1456, and richly endowed out of his ecclesiastical revenues. Kennedy was nearly connected with the royal family, his mother being the Lady Mary countess of Angus, a daughter of Robert III.[1] It appears that he had early devoted his attention to the correction of the manifold abuses which were daily increasing in the church; for which laudable purpose he twice visited Italy, and, notwithstanding his zeal in reformation, experienced the favour of the pope. Although, in his public works, in his endowments of churches, and in everything connected with the pomp and ceremonial of the Catholic faith, he was unusually magnificent; yet, in his own person,

[1] This remarkable lady, who gave birth to the last Bishop and the first Archbishop of St Andrews, was married four times:—First, to the Earl of Angus, by whom she had two sons, William and George Douglas, who successively became Earls of Angus; second, to Sir James Kennedy of Dunnure, by whom she had two sons, James, the celebrated bishop, and Gilbert, afterwards created Lord Kennedy, the ancestor of the present Marquis of Ailsa; third, to Lord Graham of Dundresmore, by whom she had two sons, James Graham the first Laird of Fintray, and Patrick Graham the first Archbishop of St Andrews; and, fourth, to Sir William Edmiston of Culloden.

and the expenditure of his private household, he exhibited a rare union of purity, decorum, and frugality: nor could the sternest judges breathe a single aspersion against either his integrity as a minister of state, or his private character as a minister of religion. Buchanan, whose prepossessions were strongly against that ancient church of which Kennedy was the head in Scotland, has yet spoken of his virtues in the highest terms of panegyric. 'His death,' he says, 'was so deeply deplored by all good men, that the country seemed to weep for him as a public parent.'"[1] To the same effect, Martine of Clermont observes, "Buchanan, (ane author sparing enough of commendations, especially of bishops, being himself a puritane, and inveterate enemie to all such and the hierarchie,) is more profuse in his praise of Kennedy than of any man else: yea, than of his patron and darling, the Earl of Moray the regent." To these testimonies I may be permitted to add that of Lindsay of Pitscottie, in his Chronicles of Scotland. "In the year of God 1466 years, Bishop James Kennedy departed out of this life, and was buried in Sanct Andrews, in the college which himself founded. This bishop was wondrous godly and wise, and well learned in divine sciences, and practised the same to the glory of God, and the weal of his church. For he caused all parsons and vicars to remain at their parish kirks, for the instruction and edifying of their flocks; and caused them to preach the word of God to the people, and visit them that were sick. And also the said bishop visited every kirk within his diocese four times in the year,[2] and preached to the said parishioners the word of God; and

[1] Tytler's History of Scotland, vol. iv. p. 205.

[2] This must refer to the small diocese of Dunkeld, of which he had been bishop. That of St Andrews was much too extensive to admit of his visiting each of its parishes so often, even if his other public duties had allowed him.

inquired of them if they were duly instructed by their parson or vicar; and if the poor were sustained, and the youth brought up, and learned according to the order that was taken in the Kirk of God. And when he found not this order kept, he made great punishment, to the effect that God's glory might shine in his diocese; leaving good example to all archbishops and kirkmen, to cause the patrimony of God's word to be used to his own glory, and to the common weal of the poor."

Soon after Kennedy was settled in his bishopric of Dunkeld, he set himself to reform abuses; and that he might obtain sufficient authority for this purpose, he undertook a journey to Italy. But at that time Pope Eugenius IV., having his attention otherwise occupied, could not give him all the assistance he required; but he bestowed on him the vacant abbacy of Scone: and when Bishop Wardlaw died, which happened before he quitted Italy, he confirmed his translation to the see of St Andrews.

In 1444, he was made chancellor of the kingdom; but finding that this involved him in more arduous duties than he could conscientiously perform, he soon after resigned that office.[1]

The Rotuli Scotiæ show a safe-conduct to this bishop through England to Rome, in 1446,[2] with thirty persons; another in 1456, to England, with the Bishop of Brechin, the Abbot of Melrose, and one hundred persons; and a third, in 1463, to England and other parts of the English dominions, with the Bishop of Glasgow, the Abbot of Holyrood, the Lord Privy Seal, several noblemen, and a suite of two hundred persons, for the purpose of concluding a treaty of peace with Edward IV.

[1] Crawford's Chancellors of Scotland, p. 32.
[2] See Appendix XXIX.

This good bishop endowed the college already referred to, with the tiends of the parishes of Cults, Kembach, Dunino, and Kilmany, and some chapelries, all of which had, till then, belonged to the bishopric. The first bull for this foundation was obtained from Pope Nicholas V.; but on account of some alterations which afterwards suggested themselves to the bishop, he applied for and obtained a new one from Pius II., in the year 1458. Out of the funds arising from the above sources, he provided for the maintenance of thirteen persons in all, (ad instar apostolici numeri;) namely, a provost, licentiate, and bachelor, (who should all be in holy orders, and lecture on theology on certain days in the week,) four masters of arts, and six *pauperes clerici*.[1] Among the charters of the college, is the bishop's foundation-charter, and two bulls of Pope Pius II., confirmatory of the same. There is also a *concordat*, in which the rights both of the citizens and students are minutely defined in their relation to each other, and the mode pointed out of settling disputes which might arise between them.[2]

The first provost whom the bishop placed over his college was John Althamar, a Scotchman, who had been educated in the Pedagogium, and was afterwards a professor in the university of Paris.

Martine, on the authority of a MS. which he possessed, tells us, that Bishop Kennedy gave to his college of St Salvator, "not only stoles for the priests, dalmatic tunics and copes, but chalices, goblets, basins, ewers, candelabras, censers, and crosses, and an image of the Saviour nearly two cubits long, besides various

[1] Appendix II. These *clerici* were young men in, what Romanists call, the inferior orders of the church; such as monks, subdeacons, acolytes, &c., and who aspired to the higher orders of deacons, priests, and bishops.

[2] Appendix I., 12.

gold and silver utensils; also large bells, small musical bells, and silk tapestry for adorning the church; in short, there was nothing outside or inside the college, which did not evince the piety, taste, and munificence of the founder."

Two sides of the quadrangle of the original building yet remain, one of which consists of the chapel, which was once a handsome gothic edifice, but has been robbed of a great part of its beauty by being modernised into a parish-kirk. It contains the monument of its pious founder, which, though greatly mutilated, is still beautiful.[1]

The hostility subsisting between Bishop Kennedy and the Douglases, and the assistance he gave to James II. in suppressing that powerful family, is matter of history. To be revenged on the bishop for his opposition to their rebellious designs, they instigated (in the year 1445) a large body of their adherents, among whom were the Earl of Crawford and Ogilvy of Innerquharity, to invade his lands in Fife; who, accordingly, made captives of his tenants, burned their houses, laid waste the produce of their fields, and carried off a large booty with them into Angus. The bishop, on learning this, deeply indignant at so wanton an outrage, repaired to his cathedral church, and solemnly excommunicated these ferocious plunderers, with the usual ceremonies of staff and mitre, bell, book, and candle; denouncing the extreme curses of the church on all who should presume to harbour or support them. The slaughter of Crawford within twelve months, when attempting to suppress a feud among his own followers,[2] together with the fate of William earl of

[1] For a more particular account of this college and its appendages, see vol. ii. Chap. ix.

[2] See the "Auchinleck Chronicle," *sub anno;* from which it appears, that no one dared to inter the body of Crawford till the bishop had withdrawn the excommunication.

Douglas, who, a few years after, fell by the hand of the king himself, were regarded as marks of the divine vengeance, and as the fulfilment of the bishop's denunciation against their persons. But even these disasters did not dispirit the family of Douglas. The surviving brothers made new efforts, raised a large army from among their followers, and menaced the king, as if he had been no more than a hostile baron, instead of a sovereign to whom they owed a dutiful obedience. James, driven almost to desperation by their increasing power and insolence, came to the castle of St Andrews, in the year 1454, to consult with his friend Bishop Kennedy, on the measures which it would be best for him to pursue in this emergency. "Sire," said the bishop, perceiving that the king was exhausted with fatigue, as well as depressed in spirits, "I entreat you to partake, first of all, of some refreshment; and, meanwhile, I will pass into my chamber and pray to God for you and the commonwealth of this realm." On rejoining the king, he led him back to his chamber, where they both knelt down together, and besought the guidance of Him who ruleth over the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth. When they had finished their prayer, and commenced their consultation, the bishop produced a bundle of arrows; and after showing the king how impossible it was even for a strong man to break them, so long as they were bound up together, but that the weakest man could do so when taken separately, he thus explained to him that it was only by dividing his enemies that he could hope to destroy them. Acting under the bishop's direction, therefore, James immediately unfurled the royal banner at St Andrews, collected what forces he could, and at the same time proclaimed an amnesty to all the followers of Douglas who should, within a given time, forsake that rebellious subject, and

repair to the king's standard. The bishop, in the mean time, took secret measures to detach Lord Hamilton and his numerous adherents from Douglas's army. In this manner, James soon saw himself at the head of 30,000 men, with whose aid he was not long in attaining his object—a result mainly attributable, under God, to the wisdom and energy of the bishop of St Andrews.

As a mark of his regard for Kennedy, and of his care for the interests of religion, James, with the consent of the three Estates of Parliament, granted what is called the "golden charter," containing very ample endowments to the bishopric of St Andrews. The same deed was afterwards confirmed by James III. to Archbishop Shevez, in 1479. A copy of it may be seen in Martine's Reliquiæ, with remarks upon it by that author: but I do not give a translation of it: *first*, because its middle-age latinity and local allusions are very obscure; and, *secondly*, because I have given, in the Appendix,[1] Charles II.'s presentation-charter of the see to Archbishop Sharp, which contains a full account of all the property belonging to it at that time, and which is, to a certain extent, a repetition of what is contained in the "golden charter;" though, from the change that had taken place in the interval, by the commutation of tithes, that species of property had sunk to about a twentieth part of its original value.

This bishop founded the monastery of Franciscan or Grey friars, (called also Minorites,) near the market-gate of the Market Street, St Andrews; and it was finished by his successor, Archbishop Graham, in 1478. This order of mendicants was of two kinds, the Con-

[1] Appendix XLIX.

ventuals and the Observantines. The former was the older of the two; but it was the latter whose monastery was in this city. They obtained their distinguishing name from *observing* the rule of St Francis their founder more rigidly than the rest, by going barefooted, and wearing no shirts. Their dress was a grey cloak and cowl, with a rope round the middle; and they went about begging with a bag. They were established in Scotland in the time of James I., and had nine convents in the principal towns of the kingdom. The one here was destroyed by the Reformers in 1559; and the only trace of it now remaining, is the *name*, "Greyfriars' garden," which is still given to the site where it stood, and on which is now a new street, called "Bell Street," in honour of Dr Bell, the founder of the Madras school.[1] The property of the monastery, which was not great, was granted by Queen Mary to the town, after the Reformation. I am not aware of any existing record of this institution, ex-

[1] Sir Robert Sibbald, and after him Bishop Keith, have reversed the sites of the Dominican and Franciscan monasteries in St Andrews; but the town charters, which I have examined, clearly prove them to have been situated as I have stated. One of these, describing a tenement "on the south side of the South Street," represents it as situated "between the church of the *Predicant* (Dominican) *friars* on the east, and the tenement of Robert Geddie on the west." There are several others to the same effect. Again, there is a charter which describes a tenement "without the port of the *Market Street*, on the north side thereof, between the crofts of George Allan on the west, and the *place of the Minor friars* on the east." Another, of September 1559, (a few months after the destruction of the religious houses in Scotland,) speaks of "a piece of waste ground *demolished in its buildings*, and lately possessed by the *Minor friars*, lying on the north side of the market-gate, and going north as far as the North Street."—MS. Catalogue of Charters, p. 236. Besides this, the old plan of St Andrews expressly calls the monastery in Market Street "edes Franciscanorum;" and that in South Street "edes Dominicanorum."

A well, more than fifty feet deep, was recently discovered in the "Greyfriars' garden." It was filled with rubbish; but, when cleared out, was found to contain excellent water. It is seven feet in diameter, and is uniformly built all round with large well hewn stones, except where it penetrates the sandstone rock. Various carved stones

cept a few casual allusions to some of its friars. in a book lately printed by the Aberdeen Spalding Club, called Necrologia Cœnobii S. Francisci Abredonensis.

This bishop also built a magnificent vessel or "barge," called the St Salvator, for the purposes of commerce, which Martine calls "a vast ship of great burden." This vessel was employed in trading with foreign countries, and continued, after Kennedy's death, to be the property of the see, till the year 1472, when she was wrecked near Bamborough, on her voyage from Flanders. All on board perished, except a very few who saved themselves in the ship's boat, among whom was the Abbot of St Colme. The abbot was taken prisoner by the English, though there was no war between the two nations, and obliged to pay £80 sterling for his ransom.[1] The vessel had on board a valuable cargo which was plundered by the English; a circumstance which produced a quarrel between the two countries. "Restitution," says Buchanan, "was often sought for, but in vain. This bred a disgust betwixt the nations for some years. At last, the English sent ambassadors into Scotland, the chiefs of whom were the Bishop of Durham and Scroop a nobleman. By these ambassadors, King Edward [IV.], who had been tossed by the inconstancy of fortune, desired a treaty of peace; which was easily renewed, upon condition that a due estimation might be made of the *ship that was rifled*, and just satisfaction made." The bishop's barge, his own monument, his college with its endowments, and his

were found among the rubbish, particularly two with the following inscriptions beautifully executed: "Si vis ad vitam ingredi, serva mandata. Mat. xix." "Mandata ejus gravia non sunt. Prime Joan. v." These stones had doubtless formed part of the monastic buildings. They are now deposited in the old chapel of St Leonard's; and, as the well was not required, it was covered over.

[1] Lesley de Rebus Gestis Scotorum, *in loco*.

monastery, are said to have amounted to no less a sum than £300,000 of our present money.

In 1455, Kennedy was a second time made chancellor of the kingdom; and in that capacity, he gave a cordial reception, in Edinburgh, to the unfortunate Henry VI. of England, who had been driven into Scotland in consequence of his defeat by the House of York. After the premature death of James in 1460, he was nominated one of the lords of regency, and guardian to James III., then only seven years of age He held these appointments till his death; and in both of them, conducted himself with such consummate prudence as to obtain the approbation of the whole kingdom, and in particular that of the young prince himself, who always styled him "carissimus avunculus noster." But so much did the prosperity of Scotland depend upon Kennedy's individual wisdom, that, after his death, both church and state fell into confusion; the clergy, for the most part, giving themselves up to simony and luxury, and the king suffering himself to be led astray by the flattery of favourites and the dreams of the superstitious.

I have casts of four different seals belonging to Bishop Kennedy, varying slightly from each other. Let a description of one suffice:—In the middle is St Andrew on his cross; above is the Virgin and Child, and below is the royal shield with a figure on each side of it; at the base is the bishop in the attitude of prayer, with his own arms on one side, and the college arms on the other. The circumscription is, "S. Jacobi Dei gracia episcopi Sancti Andree."

The bishop's name occurs twice in the Register of the Priory. In the year 1451, he obtains a bull from Pope Nicholas V., granting permission to the inhabitants of St Andrews to use butter and other lactile substances during Lent, as they did not grow olive oil,

nor could procure it, except at great expense, p. 24. In another document, p. 424, he binds himself and successors to pay £40 Scots, the prior 40 marks Scots, the chancellor of the diocese, and the Archdeacons of Lothian and St Andrews each £20 Scots, annually, towards the more becoming celebration of divine worship. In the Denmylne papers, No. 17, is a document addressed to the sub-prior and canons of St Andrews, in which the bishop takes upon himself, in the absence of their Prior William [Bonar], who was abroad, to add a few qualified persons to their number, "for the improvement of divine worship and the benefit of our church."

After this time, the Register of the Priory is wholly, and the Denmylne charters almost wholly, silent on the ecclesiastical affairs of St Andrews. At the same time, both Wyntoun and Fordun fail us. Happily, however, we have an account of the future archbishops from other sources: and in a manuscript preserved in the library of the Edinburgh University,[1] there are some brief notices of the priors during this obscure period; from which I find that William Bonar, whom I have mentioned above, succeeded Haldenstone in 1443, and ruled the priory for nineteen years; "a simple-minded man," says this authority, "who did many good deeds in his day. He furnished and adorned the library with necessary books, and expended much in aid of the poor. He supplied, at considerable expense, great and small instruments for the choir; as also, the best red cape or large hood woven with gold, which is used on the chief festivals. He died in 1462, and is buried at the 'aspersarium,' where the holy water is sprinkled, under the brazen tablet, as appears by the engraved words—'sub sigillo

1 Octavo, marked A. C. C. 26; written *circa* 1530.

æreo ut apparet ascullantibus.'" A Dennylne paper, No. 55, contains a grant, addressed to this William and his canons, dated 1445, from the Bishop of Argyll, who was lord of Balcomy in Fife, authorizing them to take stones from his quarry at Cragmore, for the repair of their church and monastery.

David Ramsay, who had been a canon of the monastery, was the next prior: "a man," says the same manuscript, "gentle and much beloved by his brethren, who did many good things, and would have done many more, had he lived. He furnished the covering of the great altar, and built the library of large square stones, well polished. He died in 1469, after being prior only seven years."

CHAPTER VIII.

Lives and Times of the Archbishops of St Andrews, from the succession of Archbishop Graham, in 1466, *till the death of Archbishop Forman, in* 1522.

XXXVIII. Patrick Graham, A.D. 1466–1478.

It is a remarkable fact, that the ecclesiastical history of Scotland is more obscure during this and the following episcopate, in other words, during the latter half of the fifteenth century, than it is for the previous two centuries. This arises from the early church writers having closed their works with their lives, and from their places not being immediately supplied by others. The accounts we have of Archbishops Graham and Shevez are unsatisfactory; and we have a feeling

that we want, but cannot obtain, more full and accurate information concerning them and their times.

We know scarcely anything of the prelate whose episcopate we are now entering upon, till the time when he became Archbishop of St Andrews, except that he was grandson of Robert III., and uterine brother of Bishop Kennedy;[1] that he was Bishop of Brechin three years before he was translated to this see; and bishop here at least five or six years before he was created metropolitan. I learn, however, from a Latin MS. oration of Dr Robert Howie, (Principal of St Mary's college in the seventeenth century,) that Graham discharged the office of Dean of the Faculty of Arts in this university in the year 1457; and, not to interrupt the future narrative, I may add farther, on the same authority, that soon after he became bishop, he allayed a sharp controversy which had arisen between John Cook rector of the university, on the one hand, and the provost and professors of St Salvator's college, on the other, as to the power of the latter to confer degrees in philosophy and theology; the quarrel being ended by the college renouncing the privilege in question, and the rector withdrawing the ecclesiastical censures which he had issued against them.[2] Graham is styled only "bishop" so late as May, 1474, in one of the documents of the Chartulary of Balmerino, recently printed.[3] I have never seen his name in any public instrument with "archiepiscopus" annexed to it, except one without a date, where he assumes it to himself, and of which I have given a copy in the Appendix.[4] And though he undoubtedly received that rank from the pope, yet, as he soon after fell into disgrace with the king and his

[1] See note p. 219.
[2] See the university MS., called "Mr Pringle's book."
[3] P. 23.
[4] Appendix XXX.

brother bishops, it may be doubted if it were ever officially given to him in Scotland.

Of what led to his elevation to the primacy we are imperfectly informed. Some have ascribed it to ambition on the part of Graham himself—and who would not, in his situation, have coveted so honourable a distinction?—others, to avarice on the part of Pope Sixtus IV., who was known to receive money for similar favours; and others again to an anxiety on the part of the Scots to have a metropolitan of their own, both to save their frequent appeals to Rome, and to get rid for ever of the pretensions of the Archbishop of York, who was from time to time reviving his old claim to jurisdiction over their church. According to Lesley, Graham earnestly entreated of the pope that the metropolitan authority might be fixed in the see of St Andrews; "because it was unjust that the Scots should be obliged to look to the Archbishop of York as their primate, when, on account of the frequent wars between Scotland and England, there must be a corresponding interruption between their churches." With a view to promote this suit more effectually, the bishop seems to have gone to Rome in person. The Rotuli Scotiæ exhibits, in the end of the year 1466, a safe-conduct to him, in company with the Earl of Crawford and Lindsay, William lord Graham, and others, with a suite of eighty persons, to proceed to England and its dependencies, Britanny, Picardy, and Flanders. It is extremely probable that the bishop took this opportunity of proceeding to Rome, and urged his entreaty so effectually that the pontiff agreed to his proposal. "The day on which this was promulgated," continues Lesley, "which was in the month of September, 1474, was joyfully celebrated by the nobility and people. But the bishops, through hatred of Graham, denied his jurisdiction, and by means of a large bribe,

prepossessed the king's mind against him." But though the fact of Graham's elevation was not publicly announced till 1474, the following extract from the "Memorabilia Scotica,"[1] (which is important on its own account,) fixes his actual elevation at two years earlier. "Order and precedence of the bishops of Scotland, in the Bull of Pope Sixtus erecting the bishopric of St Andrews to the archiepiscopal and metropolitan dignity, dated at St Peter's, in the year of the Incarnation, Sunday, 6th Kal. Septem., 1472." The bishops rank in this order: The archbishop of St Andrews, the bishops of Glasgow, Dunkeld, Aberdeen, Moray, Brechin, Dunblane, Ross, Caithness, Galloway, Lismore (Argyll,) Sodor or the Isles, and Orkney. It is then added, that "the said bull is extracted from *the Register of the archbishopric of St Andrews;*" thus proving the existence of such a document at the time, and conferring all but certainty on the accuracy of the foregoing statement.

But not only did the pope make Graham archbishop and primate, he farther bestowed upon him and his successors for ever, the dignity of *legatus natus*, and upon himself personally, the still higher office of *legatus a latere* for a period of three years, with full power to correct all abuses in the church.

In addition to the king and the clergy, the new primate had a no less formidable enemy in the family of the Boyds, who ruled everything at court at this period. The young king had been left under the joint guardianship of them and the Kennedys; but the former, by intrigue and superior address, had supplanted the latter; and as a feud was thus created between them, the Boyds were too happy to have it in their power to annoy the archbishop, who was con-

[1] Analecta Scotica, vol. ii. p. 116.

nected with the family of their rivals. He did not, therefore, return to Scotland, till he heard of their downfall. But even then, his enemies were too powerful for him; for on his arrival,[1] the first message he received was, that he must appear at Edinburgh on a day which was named, and explain why he had solicited his new dignity and authority from the pope, without having first obtained the concurrence of his sovereign. He appeared accordingly, and produced the papal bulls, which, in former times, would have been deemed a sufficient warrant for his conduct. But his enemies refused, on some pretext, to act on these instruments; and meanwhile he was commanded to confine himself to his own diocese, and to exercise no other functions than those of an ordinary bishop.

Sixtus could not, with any regard to his own authority, withdraw the archiepiscopal and legantine power with which he had invested Graham: but desirous, at the same time, of obliging the king and bishops of Scotland, he did not interfere, as he should have done, to protect the primate from their malevolence. Two hundred years before, his predecessor, Alexander IV., had acted very differently. When our Alexander III. and his courtiers had treated Bishop Gameline much in the same way in which James III. and his favourites now treated Graham, that pontiff interposed, and obliged the Scottish king to do the bishop justice; to pay him back his revenues, which had been seized; and to restore him to the full possession of his bishopric. But, at this time, it would appear that both civil and ecclesiastical affairs had fallen into a most deplorable condition. There

[1] I cannot fix the date of his arrival in Scotland; nor can I easily reconcile his subsequent treatment with what Lesley says concerning the "joyful celebration" of his promotion to the archiepiscopal dignity.

was little else than intrigues in the court, simony in the church, and bribery in the courts of justice.

The archbishop's enemies having succeeded thus far in injuring him, were resolved to prosecute their schemes till they had ruined him entirely. Among the most bitter of these enemies, was Shevez, who afterwards succeeded him in the primacy, and was made his "coadjutor" before his death.[1] This person had been educated at Louvaine, under one Spirieus, a celebrated astrologer; and by his skill in that science, had obtained the favour of James III. who was addicted to divination and every superstition. James had bestowed on his favourite the archdeaconry of St Andrews, but not without opposition from Graham, who did not consider that he possessed the qualifications requisite for the office. This made Shevez his personal enemy, who, in conjunction with John Lochy rector of the university, and some of the higher church dignitaries who were jealous of Graham, forged, it is said, accusations against him; and bribed the king, by a grant of 11,000 marks, to suspend him from performing the duties of his episcopal office, and even to prohibit him from drawing any part of his ecclesiastical revenues.

When the persecuted primate was reduced to this unhappy state, he retired to his residence at Monimeal,[2] in the hope of being permitted to enjoy at least some interval of calm. But even there he was not allowed

[1] He styles himself "coadjutor of St Andrews," in a band of manrent which he gives to the Earl of Errol, dated Edinburgh, October, 1477.—Spalding Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 252.

[2] Part of the archiepiscopal residence still remains at Monimeal, namely, an old tower, situated in what is now the Earl of Leven's garden. On one side of the parapet is the arms of the Beatons, (into which family the archbishopric afterwards fell,) with the initials C. B., probably "Cardinal Beaton." On the other side is a shield with a chevron enclosing a mollet, with the initials S. I. B. on one side, and the date 1578 on the other.

to live in peace. The cause of his new vexation arose from this:—The Roman pontiffs, or their cardinals, were in the practice of exacting large fees for bulls, metropolitan palls, appeals, dispensations, &c.; and when they who had travelled to Rome to obtain these favours, had not money enough to pay for them, there were bankers on the spot ready to advance the necessary sums, but on terms highly advantageous to themselves. Graham, when at Rome, had been under the necessity of applying to these men, who had supplied him with money to pay the extravagant fees demanded for his pall, and legantine authority.[1] This sum he had never yet repaid: and now that he was forbidden to draw anything from his diocese, they raised an action at law against him; and finding him unable to meet their demands, they threw him into prison, and made a legal claim upon his revenues.

But another and still severer blow awaited the unfortunate primate. Sixtus, hearing from his enemies an exaggerated account of his alleged errors, ordered his legate in Scotland to examine into the truth of them; and to deal with him as he might be found to deserve. The result was such as might be anticipated,—most unfavourable for the accused, who was surrounded with powerful enemies, and had no one to defend him, but such as wanted the ability to do so effectually. The legate, after a partial inquiry into his case, condemned him to deprivation of his office, and to perpetual imprisonment. The pope confirmed the sentence, and Shevez, his greatest enemy, was empowered to carry it into effect. No delay was used in enforcing this iniquitous decision. He was, first of all, thrown into the prison of his own castle of St Andrews, from which he was, in a short time,

[1] A pall was said to cost £3000 or £4000.

removed, to be confined still more closely in a cell in the distant monastery of Iona, under the charge of four keepers. These accumulated evils brought on insanity, from which he never recovered. He was subsequently removed to the abbey of Dunfermline, and finally to the island of St Serf, in Lochleven, where he soon ended his days; and was buried in the chapel of that ancient monastery, after an empty title and a most unhappy administration of thirteen years.[1] "This end," says Spotswood, "had that worthy man, in virtue and learning inferior to none of his time; oppressed by the malice and calumny of his enemies, chiefly that they feared the reformation of their wicked abuses by his means."[2]

I have a cast of a seal of this prelate before he was advanced to the primacy. In the centre is St Andrew on his cross; above is an emblem of the Trinity, and the royal arms below, with a figure on each side; at the base is the bishop praying, with his family arms on each side, slightly differing in their quarterings. The legend is, "S. Patricii Dei gracia episcopi Sancti Andree."

The prior of the monastery at this time was William Carron, who had been formerly a canon of the same house. All that is recorded of him is, that he was "vir simplex et devotus. Obiit anno salutis nostre 1482." To him succeeded the celebrated John Hepburn, of whom we shall hear more afterwards.

During this episcopate, another Scottish diocese

[1] According to Mackenzie, Graham wrote a letter to the king from his prison, cautioning him against the fatal consequences which would arise from his belief in astrology, but no attention was paid to it.

[2] Vir nullius sceleris compertus, doctrina et virtute nemini sui temporis inferior.—*Buchanan.* Yet I cannot help suspecting that there must have been some foundation for the prosecutions to which Graham was subjected; but I am not aware of any existing record of his case beyond what I have given, which is evidently defective, vague, and ex-parte.

was added to the former ones, namely, that of Orkney; for, though there were bishops there long before this time, yet they were subject to the Kings of Denmark and Norway. But in 1468, James III. having negotiated a marriage between himself and a princess of Denmark, and received the isles of Orkney and Shetland as her dowry, they became, from that time, the thirteenth diocese in Scotland.

XXXIX. William Shevez, A.D. 1478–1496.

Spotswood severely censures Shevez for having been one of his predecessor's keenest enemies; but as to his administration, he merely says, that "he was invested with the pall[1] in the church of Halirudhouse in the year 1478; the king and divers of the nobility being then present. How he governed his see, I find not; but his entry being such as we have seen, did not promise much good." To nearly the same effect, Sir James Balfour tells us, that "in the beginning of this year, is William Shevez consecrated archbishop of St Andrews, by the pope's legate, in the presence of the king, in the abbey church of Holyroodhouse; and from his hands receives a pall, the ensign of archiepiscopal dignity; and is declared, with great solemnity, primate and legate of the realm of Scotland."

Owing to a paction which had been entered into between some of the disaffected Scottish nobility and the King of England, the latter marched an army into Scotland in the year 1482, with a view to overawe

[1] The metropolitan pall is a small vestment or tippet of pure lamb's wool, having little black crosses upon it. It is made by a particular order of nuns, then duly consecrated, and laid for a short time upon the tombs of St Peter and St Paul, as emblematical of the apostolical authority which it is supposed to communicate to the archiepiscopal wearer.* The archbishops are, or were, buried in their palls.

* Lesley, lib. viii. p. 310.

James III. and his adherents; and the first time we hear of Shevez after his consecration, is his acting as one of the commissioners to effect a truce between the two parties. This led to a renewal, on the part of James, of the ancient alliance with France; for which purpose the archbishop was despatched to that country, in company with Lords Argyll, Fleming, Evandale, and Glammis; and, in their presence, Charles VIII., then only thirteen years old, confirmed the alliance by his signature, and consented to assist James both in expelling the English from his dominions, and in reducing his rebellious subjects to their obedience.

Shevez performed various journeys into "England and its dependencies," though with what view is not stated. In 1485, we find him obtaining a safe-conduct from Richard III., to proceed to England with forty persons; from whence it is probable he went to Rome, in order to obtain the papal sanction to the alliance recently concluded between Scotland and France. In two years after, he received another safe-conduct from Henry VII., for himself, a *clericus* of the name of Ireland, and a retinue of thirty-two persons. In 1488, there is another for the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Bishops of Glasgow and Aberdeen, the Abbot of Cambuskenneth, and twelve gentlemen, with fifty followers.[1] And lastly, there is, in 1491, a similar document in favour of the archbishop by himself, with forty attendants.[2] In all probability, these journeys had partly a political and partly a religious object. They might be undertaken ostensibly for the purpose of visiting the shrine of a saint, but at the same time with an ulterior purpose.

Notwithstanding Shevez's intimacy with the king,

[1] Rymer, vol. xii. pp. 326, 343, 370.
[2] See a copy of this in Appendix XXXI.

and his obligations to him, he proved so ungrateful as to take part latterly in the conspiracy which the nobility entered into against that unfortunate prince; a conspiracy which, it is well known, ended in his murder on the field of Bannockburn. But it is remarkable, that a few years previous to this, when the king escaped out of the hands of the conspirators, and there was every prospect of his taking vengeance on them, the archbishop (says Sir James Balfour, under the year 1482) was so greatly alarmed, that he voluntarily resigned the primacy in favour of Andrew Stewart, the king's uncle, who was at that time Bishop-elect of Moray, and contented himself with the latter diocese in exchange. Lesley mentions the same fact, and leaves his reader to suppose that the arrangement was a permanent one; but if it occurred at all, which may be doubted, it could have been no more than a temporary exchange of bishoprics: for it is certain that, very soon after, we find each of these prelates in his original see, as if nothing had occurred to disturb them.

At this time, it would appear, corruptions and abuses of all kinds were fast increasing in the church. "Ignorance and impiety," says Spotswood, "everywhere prevailed; till, in the end, the laity, putting their hands to the work, made that *violent and disordered reformation*, whereof in the next book we shall hear." Yet, in the midst of all this, our archbishop enjoyed a great reputation on the Continent, for his skill in science generally, but especially in astronomy. We find a foreigner, named Jasper Lact de Borchloen, dedicating a book to him on that subject, complimenting him, in the highest strain of panegyric, for his attainments in divine and human knowledge, but more particularly in mathematics, and the *scientia syderialis;* and also adverting to the flourishing state of the university

under his fostering care.[1] Dempster, in like manner, states, that "he had made such progress in astrology, theology, and medicine, that he had scarcely his equal in France or Britain."

This last writer farther informs us, that Shevez, moved by an extreme veneration for the character and useful services of the ancient Bishop St Palladius, performed a solemn pilgrimage to Fordun in the Mearns, where he had been buried a thousand years before; and that, collecting his bones carefully together, he deposited them in a silver box. According to Boethius, this box and its contents were, up to his time, exhibited to those who piously resorted to the place for the purpose of beholding them. Martine of Clermont adds, that the box was sacrilegiously seized by Wishart of Pittarow, at the time of the Reformation; after which, he says, "the family never prospered."[2]

In the year 1487, a provincial council was held at St Andrews, of which, of course, the archbishop was president. But we have no farther account of this council, all the documents connected with it having perished; nor should we have even known thus much, but that a copy of the summons to the Abbot of Arbroath to be present at it, is preserved in the chartulary of that monastery.

Robert Blacater bishop of Glasgow, had interest with Pope Innocent VIII., to get his see erected into an archbishopric, about the year 1491.[3] This excited the warm opposition of the primate, whose power and

[1] See a translated copy of this dedication in Appendix XXXII.

[2] See an account of the decline and fall of this family in the "Staggering State," p. 144.

[3] The Memorabilia Scotica, quoted in the last episcopate, says 1488, but Keith has it 1491. There seems to be some little uncertainty as to the exact date. Perhaps the attempt to procure the erection began in the former year, and was accomplished in the latter. Balfour's Annals, A.D. 1491.

patronage were thus diminished. So far did he carry his opposition, that he gave a permanent and very advantageous lease of the archiepiscopal estate of Muckartshire to the Earl of Argyll, on the condition of obtaining his powerful interest to oppose the said erection; but it was to no purpose. The primate lost his cause, and the earl retained his lease. We have no particulars of this controversy, except that it caused a general interest throughout the country, and for a time divided the principal families into two hostile parties. It was finally determined that Dunkeld, Dunblane, Brechin, Aberdeen, Moray, Ross, Caithness, and Orkney, should be subject to St Andrews; while Galloway, Argyll, and the Isles, should be under the jurisdiction of Glasgow; the former continuing to retain the primacy. But this settlement afterwards gave rise to much jealousy between the two archbishopries: St Andrews asserting a jurisdiction over the whole of Scotland; while Glasgow contended for an independent authority within its own diocese. This feeling betrayed itself in the time of Archbishop James Beaton, who wrote to Rome more than once, to complain of the contumacy of "his suffragan the Archbishop of Glasgow," as he terms him;[1] and again, in the episcopate of Cardinal Beaton, the servants of the two archbishops contended with so much eagerness for priority in a procession through the streets of Glasgow, that they tore each other's rochets, and threw down the crosses and banners which they were carrying.[2]

Just about the time of Shevez's death, there arrived at St Andrews, Monsieur Roderic de la Laine, with sixty *gens d'armes* and a supply of military stores from France, to assist James IV. in his intended in-

[1] Appendix XXXVI.

[2] Major de Gestis Scotorum, lib. x. p. 443.

vasion of England, in support of the pretensions of the celebrated Perkin Warbeck. James, however, it is well known, soon changed his mind in regard to that adventurer, and left him to follow his own fortunes.

Shevez died at St Andrews, and was buried "before the high altar of the cathedral, in a monument of brasse provided for him."

Among the university charters, there is one of this archbishop, dated 1479, specially exempting the professors, who are mentioned by name, from the payment of all imposts, and from every species of molestation.[1] The same prelate grants his confirmation to the foundation and endowment of the chapel and altar of St John Baptist, by Alexander Inglis, archdeacon of St Andrews, "situated on the north side towards the west, in the aisle commonly called the Archdeacon's aisle, in the metropolitan church, for the safety of his soul, and those of his predecessors and successors," &c. &c.[2] This prelate also, in 1496, converted the parish of Forteviot into a provision for an additional prebendary in St Salvator's college, "for sustenance of ane prebendare, to serve and sing in the quier." The endowment was lost in the tumult of the Reformation, but restored to the college by an act of the Scottish parliament, in 1592, on the condition of supporting the parish minister out of the teinds, as far as they would admit.[3]

The archbishop's seal is large, and elaborately cut. St Andrew is in the centre, holding his cross in his right hand, and a book in his left. Above, is the usual emblem of the Trinity—the Father holding the crucifix before him, while a dove is lighting upon it. There is a figure on each side, one of whom is a bishop; the

[1] Appendix I. 14. [2] Ibid. XXXIII. 1.

[3] These tiends still yield a profit to the college of £60 or £70 per annum.

other an angel with wings, holding a pair of scales and a sword. The bishop himself is below, in an erect position, holding a long cross over his left shoulder, with a figure on each side of him—the one a warrior, with a spear in his right hand; the other a huntsman, with a dog playfully leaping upon him. All these figures are under canopies, beautifully cut. The whole is surmounted by the royal arms. The only words legible are, "S ..... archiepi. Sti. Andree;" but the seal is known to have belonged to Shevez, from the charter to which it was attached.

XL. James Stewart, A.D. 1497–1503.

This primate was the second son of James III., by his consort Margaret of Denmark, and was, singularly enough, christened James, though his elder brother was so named before him. He was created Duke of Ross and Marquis of Ormond, and provided with the lands and lordships of Brechin, Nevar, Ardmanach, and Netherdale. One Shaw, abbot of Paisley, was made his tutor, who seems to have given him a taste for the church; for when it was proposed to contract a marriage between him and the Lady Catherine, daughter of Edward IV. of England, he signified his determination of going into holy orders. On the death of Shevez, he was immediately nominated to the primacy, though not more than twenty-one years of age; the pope dispensing, in his favour, with the canons which relate to the age of obtaining such high preferment. After his nomination, he set out on a journey to Rome, to receive confirmation and investiture from Alexander VI.: and when he passed through England, on his way thither, he obtained a very complimentary safe-conduct,[1] and

[1] Rymer, vol. xii. p. 670. Henry calls him "reverendissimus in

flattering reception from his royal kinsman, Henry VII. On his return from Rome, his brother James IV. made him Commendator of Holyrood and Dunfermline, and Chancellor of the kingdom. History records no other particulars of him. The last occasion on which I find him mentioned, is at the marriage of his brother, James IV., to the Princess Margaret of England, which was celebrated at Holyrood House, in August 1503. The narrator of the ceremony says, "After this, the kyng was served in vesselle gylt, as the quene. The Archbyschops of Saunt Andrew and of York, the Byschop of Durham, and the Erle of Surrey, dyned with hym."[1] This prelate is supposed to be celebrated by Ariosto, in his Orlando Furioso, canto x., in these words:—

Non è un sì bello in tante altre persone,
Natura il fece, e poi ruppe la stampa.
Non è in cui tal virtù tal grazia luca,
Otal possanza, ed è di Rosi è Duca.

Which are thus translated by Hoole:—

No form so graceful can your eyes behold,
For nature made him, and destroyed her mould;
The title of the Duke of Ross he bears,
No chief like him in dauntless mind compares.[2]

He died soon after his brother's marriage, at the early age of twenty-eight, and was buried in his cathedral church, among the bishops his predecessors.

In Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, there are some curious particulars concerning the funeral of this royal prelate, which seems to have been conducted on a

Christo, ac præcarissimus consanguineus noster;" and alludes to the purity of his life and manners, and his other eminent virtues.

[1] See preface to the Charters of Holyrood, p. lxvi.

[2] One translator of Ariosto refers these lines to the Duke of Ross, the bishop; another to the Duke of Rothesay, the king's eldest son. It is easy to conceive that the Italian poet would be very apt to confound them.

magnificent scale. The cost of the various articles amounted to nearly £300. The body was "trussed in wax," and a great number of torches were consumed: from which we may conclude, that the funeral took place by night. A procession of cross-bearers, acolytes, and thurifers led the way; the prior and other dignified clergy followed in the train, and the whole procession was closed by 436 persons, carrying banners with armorial bearings, which were deposited round the corpse in the cathedral church, while the obsequies were being celebrated at the high altar. Sums of money also were distributed, on the occasion, among the Franciscan friars and the poor of the city.

The cast of this archbishop's seal is the largest and handsomest in my collection; but the devices and figures being very nearly the same as in those of Shevez, except the shield, I need not repeat the description of them. The only difference is, that on St Andrew's left is a bishop in the act of blessing, and on his right shoulder a dove descending, perhaps meant to indicate the Holy Spirit giving effect to the blessing. The inscription which surrounds it, is as follows: S. IA. ARCHIEPI. SCI. ANDR. TOTIUS SCOTIE, PRIMAT. SE. AP. LEGATI, DUCIS ROSSIE BTE. CRUC. COMENDATAR.; *i. e.*, the seal of James archbishop of St Andrews, Primate of all Scotland, Legate of the Apostolic see, Duke of Ross, and Commendator of Holyrood.

Among the university charters is a deed by this prelate, in which he confirms the foundation and endowment of the chapel and altar of St John the Evangelist, by Robert de Fontibus archdeacon of St Andrews, in St John's aisle of the cathedral church, for the safety of the souls of the present and late archbishops, and those of his father and mother, &c.[1]

[1] Appendix XXXIII. 2.

XLI. Alexander Stewart, A.D. 1506–1513.

This talented and accomplished, but unfortunate young man, was the natural son of James IV., by Mary Boyd, daughter of Archibald Boyd of Bonshaw. He received his early education from Patrick Panther, a distinguished scholar, who, by applying to the acquisition of classical literature, and the imitation of the writers of the Augustan age, contributed to introduce a purer style among his countrymen than had prevailed before. Panther acquitted himself so well in his office, that his royal master rewarded him with the abbey of Cambuskenneth, and took him into his own service as Latin secretary. In 1505, young Stewart was put under the care of the celebrated Erasmus, who soon came to entertain the highest opinion of his learning and piety; and in one of his published letters, thus expresses himself concerning him:—"I was at one time domesticated with him in the town of Sienna, (in urbe Senensi,) where I instructed him in Greek and Rhetoric. Good Heavens! how quick, how attentive, how persevering in his studies! how many things he accomplished! At one and the same time he learnt law —not a very agreeable study, on account of its barbarous admixtures, and the irksome verbosity of its interpreters:—he heard lectures on rhetoric, and declaimed on a prescribed thesis, exercising alike his pen and his tongue: he learnt Greek, and every day construed the part which had been assigned him, within a given time. In the afternoons he applied himself to music, to the virginals, the flute, or the lute, (*monochordiis, tibiis, testudini,*) accompanying them sometimes with his voice. Even at meals he did not intermit his studies. The chaplain always read some useful book, such as the decretals of the popes, or St Jerome, or

St Ambrose; nor was the voice of the reader ever interrupted, except when some of the doctors, in the midst of whom he sat, made an observation, or when he himself asked the meaning of anything he did not clearly understand. At other times he would listen to tales, but short, and connected with literature. In this manner, no part of his life was exempt from study, except what he devoted to piety and sleep. And, if he had any spare time, he employed it in reading history, in which he took great delight. Thus it happened, that, though a very young man, scarcely out of his eighteenth year, he excelled not only in every kind of learning, but in every quality which one can admire in a man. Nor did that happen to him which sometimes happens to others, 'the more apt at letters, the less apt at morals;' for his morals were pure, yet mixed with uncommon prudence. His mind was noble, and far above sordid affections; yet so constituted, that there was nothing forward or fastidious about him. Though he felt acutely, he was accustomed to repress his feelings, and never allowed his passions to be inflamed—so great was the mildness and moderation of his nature. He greatly enjoyed wit and humour; but it was of a literary kind, and not too caustic; that is, he loved not the wit of Momus so much as that of Mercury. If any discord arose among the servants of the household, it was admirable with what dexterity and candour he would allay it. In a word, he was religious without being superstitious. No king was ever blessed with a more accomplished son." But whatever might be his merits, nothing surely could excuse his being placed, at so early an age, in so responsible a situation as the primacy of Scotland. But indeed the whole history of this period shows that church benefices had become a mere matter of traffic among the leading men of the

day. Every noble family had one or two of its members in the church; and every ecclesiastic, with the sanction of the pope, but in violation of the ecclesiastical canons, got as many benefices for himself as he could, without the least regard to his fitness for the performance of the duties annexed to them.

Owing to the archbishop's extreme youth, the see was kept vacant for him for some years. In reference to this, the king his father wrote the following curious letter to Julius II., who seems to have been of a very facile and indulgent disposition towards royal suppliants. The letter is without any date, but was probably written early in 1508. "Most holy father, the affairs of the chiefs of the Christian flock are daily referred to your holiness, commending themselves and the churches of the Catholic faith to you the keeper of the keys, and making known to you the things which concern religion. In this way, we have often had occasion to address you, bountiful father, and never in vain. You evinced your paternal regard for us in no trivial manner, when, at the beginning of your pontificate, you healed our soul with the most ample remission of our sins; which is the greatest of all favours, inasmuch as the salvation of the soul is of the highest importance.[1] Even to this, though so ample, you have added another favour, in that you have committed to our son, though a youth, the archiepiscopate of St Andrews; and not long after, you admitted our ambassadors to your audience, both publicly and privately, and granted them all they asked. These and other favours make me solicitous that I should not prove my-

[1] Amplissimo remissionis indulto: perhaps plenary indulgence. But the sin which preyed most upon his mind was his having conspired against his father. He obtained pardon on the condition of wearing an iron chain round his waist for the remainder of his life, and by this his body was recognised among the slain at Flodden field.

self an unworthy son of so benevolent a father; especially, as God of his mercy has granted that our ancestors have been always obedient to the apostolic see, since the time of Pope Marcus, the 34th from St Peter, in the reign of the Emperor Constantine. But our mind is, holy father, to administer, with the more vigilant care, the archiepiscopate committed to our son, lest your holiness should regret having granted our petition, or we repent of having asked it. We have, therefore, recommended to your holiness ——, an approved person, who has long been of the order of the Dominicans, of great religious experience, and skilled in Holy Scripture. Him we would have to be ordained to the episcopate, to some ancient title of a vacant church, that, as a wise father, he may take the superintendence of the tender archbishop, whose early age may thus be compensated for by the experience of so learned a man. He is truly deserving of this honour; and the episcopal authority superadded to his gravity and prudence, will make him a useful and able suffragan. We will take care to provide him with a suitable income. May the most High always preserve you for the government of his church!"[1]

James wrote another letter of the same import to the cardinal of St Eusebius, the protector of Scottish affairs at the court of Rome. In both he speaks of the favourable reception of his ambassadors by the pope; and as Balfour in his "Annals," under the year 1507, states, that "the Archbishop of St Andrews, and the Earl of Arran" went in that capacity to France, it seems probable that they proceeded to Rome also, and that these are the ambassadors alluded to in the said letters.

[1] Epist. Regum Scotiæ.

After being under the tuition of Erasmus, young Stewart was sent to Padua, to complete his studies under the superintendence of Sir Thomas Halkerton, provost of the collegiate church of Crichton. I have given in the Appendix, two letters which he wrote to his father from the above city, which will confirm the remark just made, regarding the disposal of church property in that age.[1]

In 1510, Stewart returned to Scotland, and though no more than eighteen years of age, he was not only settled in the archbishopric of St Andrews, but made Lord Chancellor, as well as Abbot of Dunfermline and Prior of Coldingham, *in commendam*. The privilege of electing their own superiors was originally enjoyed by all the monastic communities, and had been secured to them by the popes themselves; but by this time it had fallen into general desuetude, the power being commonly exercised by the king, who, when an abbey became vacant, had little difficulty in obtaining from his holiness a mandate directing the monks to choose the person whom he *recommended*. This soon led to the more corrupt practice of granting the revenues of religious houses to bishops and secular priests, who, not having taken the monastic vows, could neither reside in them, nor were duly qualified to preside over them. And out of this abuse arose the still greater one of committing these charges to laymen, and even to infants! Thus, James V. bestowed upon his four natural sons, the rich abbeys of Coldingham, Kelso, Holyrood, and St Andrews; he himself drawing the rents of them during their minority: from which, says Bishop Lesley, he received a larger revenue than from the whole of his royal patrimony! This certainly was a great abuse, and loudly called for reformation,

[1] Appendix XXXV.

had not our Reformers, when they got the ascendancy, themselves perpetuated and even aggravated this very abuse, as we shall discover in the sequel: so much easier is it to discover errors than to correct them; and so liable are men, when getting rid of one evil, to introduce a greater in its place!

The several dignities and emoluments above-mentioned, the juvenile primate enjoyed for three years, till he lost his life, with the king his father, at the unfortunate battle of Flodden field, on the 9th of September, 1513. The particulars of this fatal battle are well known; and even were they less so, it would be foreign to my purpose to enter upon them. But there is one circumstance connected with it, relating to the conduct of our archbishop, on which I may be allowed to make a passing observation. James, before the main action, took several castles belonging to the English, and, among others, that of Ford, in which he found the wife of the governor, the Lady Heron, and her daughter, both of whom are represented to have been very handsome persons. The mother was naturally attached to her husband and countrymen, and consulted their interest. On the other hand, James was an admirer of the fair sex; and the archbishop, who must have been much with his father, was at that age when, though a churchman, he could scarcely be insensible to female charms. This is all that is known; but the prurient imagination of some modern historians has supplied the rest. One of these, now before me, remarks, "while James wasted his time in fatal dalliance with the mother, the archbishop became the paramour of the daughter." What is here insinuated *might* possibly be true; but I assert that there is no ground whatever for believing it: and I envy not those persons who first convert imagination into uncharitable suspicion, and then suspicion into reality. That

James, and perhaps his son, saw the ladies, is probable, because there was a negotiation for sparing the castle of Ford. But that a noble matron should surrender her own honour, and that of her daughter, to the enemies of her country; and that a churchman of the high character given of him by Erasmus, should, on the eve of a bloody battle which might prove fatal to him, take advantage of the captivity of a young female to work her dishonour, is a supposition which every one, doubtless, may make, but which no one ought to entertain without more proof of the fact than we are at present in possession of. Besides this, there was no time for the "dalliance" in question, for only six days were occupied in taking Wark, Etall, and Ford; and, what is more, James *refused* to save the castle of Ford, and actually destroyed it, which was no proof of a secret understanding between him and its proprietress.

"Archbishop Stewart," says Martine, "augmented the stipends of the professors of the pedagogie, (the name still given to Bishop Wardlaw's foundation,) which formerlie were but small, and gave to them the fruits of the church of St Michael of Tarvet, near Cowper. He rebuilt the chapel of St John the Evangelist in the pedagogie; but where it stood is now uncertain." The original charter conveying the church of St Michael to the college, which afterwards became St Mary's, still exists, but the concluding part of it is illegible.[1] The seal of this prelate contains the same devices with the two preceding ones, but the last words of the legend I have not been able to decipher: —"S. Alexandri archiepi. Sancti Andree toti. Scotie primat. se. aple. ....."

During this and the foregoing episcopate, John

[1] See Appendix IV. 1.

Hepburn was prior of the monastery, to which he had succeeded in 1482. In 1512, he, in concurrence with the archbishop and the king, founded the college of St Leonard's, and endowed it with the tithes of the parish of that name; and also with certain funds belonging to an hospital situated within the precincts of the monastery, which had been erected in very ancient times for the reception of pilgrims who came to adore the relics of St Andrew. The attendance of these pilgrims having fallen off, the hospital was afterwards converted into an asylum for aged women; it then became a school for the education of youth generally; and now at length it was judged expedient to apply the revenues to the endowment of a college for the study of philosophy and theology, in which a certain number of poor students should be instructed gratuitously.[1] This college being purely a monastic institution, the prior and conventual chapter were its patrons, and supplied it with teachers from among themselves. It was endowed for the support of one principal master; four chaplains, two of whom were regents; twenty scholars, six of whom were students of theology; and about ten foundation students: but these last might be increased or diminished, according as the funds of the institution admitted. The college soon acquired so much repute, that many of the sons of the nobility and gentry repaired to it. The students, among other accomplishments, were carefully instructed in sacred music, (the Gregorian *cantus* and *discantus*, as they were termed,) and became so celebrated for their skill in that art, that many of them were employed after the Reformation in teaching it.

The three original foundation-charters of this college still exist. The archbishop may be said to be

[1] The inscription on the original seal of the college runs thus:—"S. cōe. collegii pauperum Sancti Leonardi."

the founder of the college; the prior and canons of the monastery endow it with a great variety of property, chiefly in St Andrews and the county of Fife, but with some also in Edinburgh, Leith, and Haddington; and James IV. grants his confirmation to the two previous charters, in which it is somewhat singular to find him designating his *own son*, then only twenty-two years of age, "the most reverend and venerable *father* in Christ, our beloved councillor Alexander, by divine mercy Archbishop of St Andrews, primate of all Scotland, legate, &c."[1] Alas! the next year both father and son were mangled corpses on the field of Flodden.

Among the Dunmylne papers, is a receipt dated 1506, from the archbishop to Prior Hepburn, for money which the latter had drawn from his see and remitted to him.[2]

XLII. Andrew Forman, A.D. 1515–1522.

After the premature death of Archbishop Stewart, the queen-regent offered the primacy to the celebrated William Elphinston bishop of Aberdeen, who agreed to accept it, but died before his translation. There then appeared on the field three competitors for the see: the well-known Gavin Douglas, author of the metrical translation of Virgil's Æneid, and perhaps the most learned and virtuous ecclesiastic of the age; John Hepburn prior of St Andrews; and Andrew Forman bishop of Moray, commendator of Dryburgh and Pittenweem,[3] and of Cottingham in England. The queen and the Earl of Angus supported the preten-

[1] Appendix III. 1. [2] Appendix VII. 18.

[3] His arms may still be seen at Pittenweem, built into the wall of the Episcopal chapel in that burgh. There is an inscription underneath, a very few words only of which are legible.

sions of Douglas, with whose assistance he took possession of the castle of St Andrews. Hepburn, on his side, had the address to get himself elected by the canons of his priory; and, having succeeded in wresting the castle from Douglas' followers, he kept it against a strong force with which the Earl of Angus endeavoured to retake it. During this contest, the peaceable translator of the Æneid retired from the field in disgust; and, to add to his misfortune, he was soon after imprisoned by the Regent duke of Albany, for twelve months, in the very same castle which he had good grounds to expect would have been his archiepiscopal palace, for no other reason than because the enemies of his family had acquired a temporary ascendency in the state; for, in those unhappy times, neither rank nor learning, nor innocence itself, could protect their possessor, if he or his friends had the misfortune to be obnoxious to the party in power. He soon after obtained the bishopric of Dunkeld from the pope, and fondly thought he had nothing more to do than to take quiet possession of it. But when he reached Dunkeld, he found his cathedral and palace occupied by Andrew Stewart, son of the Earl of Atholl, who had been elected by the canons, and refused to relinquish his claim till compelled by force of arms; and even then, not without receiving two of the best benefices in the diocese as a recompense for his disappointment! But we shall hear of Douglas again; and, meanwhile, we must return to Forman.

He was a wealthy and fortunate, but intriguing and ambitious ecclesiastic, who had been long employed by James IV. as his ambassador at foreign courts. In Rymer's Fœdera, there is a treaty of peace with Henry VII., signed by Forman, at Hanworth, in 1509, on behalf of his king, in which he swears, "by the holy Evangelists and the canon of the mass," that the same

should be inviolably observed.[1] When he went to the Continent, he obtained permission from his master to seek, by himself or his procurators, at the court of Rome, any vacant Scottish prelacy, though already far from being ill provided for.[2] So much did he ingratiate himself with Louis XII. of France, when at his court, that he gave him the rich archbishopric of Bourges; in return for which he engaged, it is said, to instigate his master to take part with France against England—an engagement which proved but too successful, as it led to the disastrous battle of Flodden: though it must be mentioned, to the honour of James, that throughout the whole of the negotiations he evinced the utmost anxiety for peace.

The following letters, which passed at this time between James and Pope Julius II. respecting Forman, will throw some additional light on his history and character. The king thus addresses the pope: "Most holy Father, *felicitatem*. From the reverend father, Andrew bishop of Moray, our counsellor and ambassador, we have learnt the disposition of your holiness towards us, seeing you have loaded him with honours, and confirmed the privileges of our chapel royal[3] at our request. We thank you, and we will not cease to value your kindness towards us. Our ambassador of Moray is at present at the court of our most Christian brother the King of the French, endeavouring to effect a peace, in which I wish he may succeed: so that your holiness may show yourself a gracious father, and the most Christian king a dutiful son; and that both your armies may be diverted from each other, against the enemy of Christ. Our ambassador, who spares no

[1] Vol. xiii. p. 261.

[2] Epistolæ Regum Scotiæ, vol. i. p. 110. The permission is dated 1510.

[3] At Stirling.

labour to bring about so desirable an end, anxiously desires the honour of the cardinalate which your holiness long since promised him, in your apostolical brief addressed to us; an honour of which he is most deserving, as we know from long experience, and which we are persuaded your holiness will find to be true. From our palace at Edinburgh, prid. Kal. Feb. 1511."[1] To which letter the pope thus replies: "Dearest son in Christ, *salutem*. We had conceived a high opinion, from the letter of your highness, of the venerable father, Andrew bishop of Moray, whom you have sent as your ambassador to the apostolic see. But after he came, and began to transact your and our affairs, we conceived a much higher opinion of him. For he has used, and still uses, so much prudence and diligence, as satisfies us that he is deserving of being advanced to higher honours. Mindful, therefore, of your commendation, and desirous to accomplish your wish, to honour your kingdom, and reward the merits of the said bishop, we have determined, at our first creation of cardinals, God willing, to make the said Andrew a cardinal, and to number him among our other venerable brothers of the holy Roman church; and this we have thought right, in our paternal kindness, to signify to your highness by these letters. Given at Bonania, under the piscator's seal, 6 May, 1511, the 8th year of our pontificate."

Julius did not live long enough to gratify Forman's ambition by making him a cardinal; but he sent James IV. a present of a consecrated sword and scabbard, and bestowed on him the title of "Protector of the faith."[2] Yet, when this protector of the faith after-

[1] Epistolæ Regum Scotiæ, vol. i. pp. 142, 136.

[2] This sword and scabbard are still preserved among the *regalia* in the castle of Edinburgh. The former has on the blade, indented in gold letters, Julius II., P.

wards lent his assistance to the French, against whom Julius had declared war, he formally excommunicated him: so little dependence could be put on the favour of the capricious old pontiff, and so small a matter could convert his blessing into a curse!

But, in the meantime, Forman managed matters so well for himself, that Leo X., Julius's successor, made him his *legatus a latere* for Scotland; and, when the primacy became vacant, he issued his bull appointing him to fill it.[1] Fortified with this powerful document, he made his appearance in Scotland in June 1515, where he found the court, a great part of the nobility, and the canons of St Andrews who were in Hepburn's interest, all so much opposed to him, that at first he could find no one willing to espouse his cause, and publish his bull. He was of the family of Forman of Hutton in the Merse, which were adherents of the Humes. At this time, the Lord Chamberlain Hume was one of the most powerful noblemen in Scotland. To him Forman applied for assistance, and obtained it on the promise of using his interest to procure a rich abbey for his youngest brother. With this support, and that of no less than 10,000 armed men, whom he took into his pay, he marched to Edinburgh, and had his bull publicly proclaimed at the market-cross of that city. As soon as these tidings reached Hepburn, leaving a military force in the castle of St Andrews to defend it, he came to Edinburgh, with Lord Hailes and as many of his friends and followers as he could assemble. But finding himself unable to make any head against his opponent there, he is said to have gone to Rome, where he met with no better success. "In

[1] Leo had given it, in the first instance, to his own nephew Cardinal Cibo; but he cancelled the appointment on learning that it would be repugnant to the feelings of the Scots to see the highest ecclesiastical office in their country bestowed on a foreigner.

short," as the Regent Duke of Albany says in a letter to Pope Leo X. on this subject, "after a thousand modes of restoring peace had been thought of, and one design abandoned in favour of another, which proved equally unsuccessful, Forman, desiring above all things the quiet of the kingdom, gave up himself and his interests to our arbitration, stipulating only that the apostolical dignity might be preserved. We, therefore, brought about a settlement, though not without injury to Forman and his supporters, who, however, were willing to make certain concessions to their antagonists for the sake of peace." The result was, that the papal favourite was put in possession of the primacy, and the abbey of Dunfermline; but on the condition that Hepburn should retain the rents he had already collected; continue to receive, besides, those of the church and lands of Kirkliston, which belonged to the archbishopric;[1] and, finally, that his brother should be made Bishop of Moray, and his nephew, Prior of Coldingham. Such was the simoniacal termination of this most unbecoming contest; a contest which could not fail to lower the character of churchmen in the eyes of the public, and so prepare the way for the mighty changes which followed.

I have dwelt longer on the history of Forman before his succession to the primacy, because I have not discovered any particulars concerning him, during the few years he held it, except that, when the Regent Duke of Albany had occasion to go to France in the year 1517, he left him one of the governors of the kingdom during his absence. He died at Dunfermline, and was buried in the church of that monastery, of which he was commendator. "In this prelate," says Guthrie, "Scotland lost one of the chiefest statesmen of his

[1] Appendix XXXVIII.

age. Though he was by birth scarcely a gentleman, yet he ennobled all his preferments. Though a deep politician, he was candid and open in his manners; and of so generous a spirit, that he bestowed, in acts of hospitality, the large revenues of the two archbishopries he possessed in France and Scotland."

According to Dempster, he wrote, 1. Contra Lutherum; 2. De Stoica Philosophia; 3. Collectanea Decretalium.

I have a cast of this prelate's *sigillum rotundum*. In the centre is St Andrew holding his cross before him, with a Madona on one side, and a female figure on the other, holding a casket or reliery. The family shield is below. The circumscription is "S. Andree Forman archiep. S. Andree totius regni primat. ac aplice sedis. legat. nati." But in a charter, dated 1518, he designates himself more fully, thus: "Andreas, miseratione divina, Sancti Andree archiepiscopus, totius regni Scotiæ primas, apostolice sedis legatus natus, ac per universum regnum predictum, ejusdem sedis cum potestate et facultate legati de latere legatus."[1]

Prior John Hepburn presided over the monastery during this episcopate, and died in the same year with the archbishop. We have already seen his unsuccessful attempt to obtain the primacy for himself. But being an able politician, and well acquainted with the state of the country, he exercised considerable sway over the counsels of the Regent Albany, who often consulted him respecting the characters and strength of the different factions into which the Scottish nobility

[1] The gossiping Lindsay of Pitscottie tells an anecdote of Forman —too absurd as well as too profane to be repeated—the object of which is to show that *he did not know Latin;* as if one who had visited Rome, and most of the European courts, as an ambassador, besides being an eminent prelate of the Latin Church, could be unacquainted with a language which he must have been in the habit of speaking and writing during the greater part of his life!

were at that time divided. Towards the close of his life, he built the extensive and lofty wall which surrounds the priory and St Leonard's college, of which the greater part is still standing. The reason of its being erected at that particular time, is not very apparent. This wall commences at the north-east buttress of the east gable of the cathedral, and passes round by the harbour to the foot of the East-burn Wynd. It then runs behind the houses on the west side of the wynd, as far as St Leonard's hall. The remainder no longer exists; but it formerly extended from the hall, till it joined the west front of the cathedral. The wall is about twenty feet high, measures nearly a mile in extent, and has thirteen round or square towers, each of which has two or three richly canopied niches, which have long since been despoiled of their images; for to the iconoclasts of the Reformation, every saintly resemblance of the human form seemed an object of idolatry, and as such was doomed to destruction. On various parts of the wall may be seen the arms of the prior; viz., two lions pulling at a rose, upon a chevron, the head of a crosier for a crest, the initials J. H. or sometimes P. J. H., (Prior John Hepburn,) and the motto *ad vitam*. One of these has the date 1520. There are three gateways in the wall; one at the harbour, another on the south side, and the third is what is called the *pends*. This last was the main entrance to the priory, and must have been, when complete, a very noble piece of architecture. It is seventy-seven feet long, and sixteen broad, and consists of two very elegant pointed arches, one at either extremity; and there are evident marks of three intermediate groined arches, which supported apartments above, where, probably, the porter and other domestics of the priory were accommodated.

Boethius, who wrote while the priory wall was ac-

tually in progress—viz. in 1522—thus speaks of it and the monastery generally, as well as of the good qualities of its religious inmates:—"The monastery (coenobium) also has been in our times, greatly decorated through the industry of that noble and illustrious coenobiarch, John Hepburn, also called prior, who renewed the buildings which had become dilapidated, made numerous improvements, and at great expense adorned the cathedral, than which nothing can be more suitable for divine worship. And then he surrounded the whole with a wall, which is strengthened by numerous projecting towers. This wall also embraces St Leonard's college, where the novices and others learn the rudiments of science under their preceptors, and are instructed in human and divine knowledge, and in the precepts of religious obedience; from which source the monastery itself derives additional lustre. There were there, in ancient times, priests of God, called *Cultores dei*, (Culdees,) and afterwards, regular canons of the order of St Augustine: the first of whom were not less remarkable for their piety than for their learning; and the latter, at this day, act zealously up to the rules of their order, and, when relieved from their devotional duties, apply to the study of literature. So that if you regard literature, you would say that their college is distinguished in this respect, under the care of its venerable conductors. If you look to piety, you would assert that nothing could be more admirable than the divine harmony with which they perform their devotions. And if you turn your eyes to the magnificence of the buildings, you would conclude that there was nothing in Italy, France, or Germany, superior to them. But in the year in which I now write, death has carried off the aforesaid John the coenobiarch, to the great loss both of the Scottish nation and the cause of learning. But happily, before he died,

he procured his nephew, Patrick Hepburn, a learned and good man, to be appointed his successor, who, it is to be hoped, will complete the works which his uncle commenced."

On one of the towers of the above-mentioned wall, near the harbour, is the following inscription:—RECESSORIS (Precessoris?) OP. POR. (opus porrectum, or, operis portio?) HIC PATET HEPBURN EXCOLIT EGREGIUS ORBE SALUT—; which probably means, that the illustrious Patrick Hepburn adorned the work which his predecessor John had so far constructed, in the year ——.

CHAPTER IX.

Lives and Times of the Archbishops of St Andrews, from the Succession of Archbishop James Beaton in 1523, *till the Murder of Cardinal Beaton in* 1546.

XLIII. James Beaton, A.D. 1523–1539.

At the period now under our review, almost every vacancy in the Scottish bishopries gave rise to a contest between the courts of Rome and Scotland. The right of choosing a bishop originally belonged, as we have seen, to the chapter of the cathedral; but this had gradually lapsed to the king, or the Roman pontiff. The latter had this advantage, that, according to the canon law, no churchman could take possession of a benefice without a papal bull confirming his appointment; while, on the other hand, the king had it in his power, if he chose to exert it, to exclude a churchman who was obnoxious to him.

On the present occasion, two candidates for the

primacy took the field—James Beaton archbishop of Glasgow, who was supported by the regent and the three Estates of Scotland; and Gavin Douglas bishop of Dunkeld, who solicited the appointment from the pope, through the interest of Henry VIII., at whose court he was at this time residing. A letter was sent to the pope from the regent and three Estates, acquainting him, that the bishop of Dunkeld had fled to their enemy, the King of England, on which account they had issued a sentence of banishment and sequestration against him; and therefore they earnestly entreated his holiness not to listen to any application that might be made for advancing him to the archbishopric of St Andrews.[1] How this contest might have ended it is impossible to say; for Douglas died in 1522, which left the primacy open to Beaton, who succeeded to it the following year without opposition.

No churchman was more implicated in the political intrigues of the times in which he lived, or experienced greater vicissitudes of fortune, than Archbishop James Beaton. He was the youngest son of the Laird of Balfour in Fife, and had been Bishop of Galloway, Archbishop of Glasgow, Provost of Bothwell, Abbot of Dunfermline, Arbroath, and Kilwinning, Chancellor, and Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, before being translated to St Andrews. As his primatial episcopate will be a longer and more eventful one than ordinary, I pass over his previous history, except to mention, that when at Glasgow, he surrounded his palace with a magnificent wall, augmented several of the altarages in the cathedral, and repaired many of the bridges within his regality, which had fallen to decay. On all of these works he affixed his arms, blazoned in their proper tinctures, some of which are to be seen to this day.

[1] Epistolæ Regum, vol. i. p. 323.

In 1524, we find the archbishop imprisoned at Berwick, and deprived of the chancellorship, for having joined the party against Arran and the queen-mother; who wished the young king, then only twelve years old, to be declared of age, and to assume the government: a measure which was well known to be prompted by Henry VIII., in order to promote his own views upon Scotland. So anxious was that monarch to secure this object, that he promised Beaton to obtain for him a cardinal's hat, if he would withdraw his opposition: an offer which the primate rejected with disdain. His enemies then threatened to apply to the pope to send a legate into Scotland for the purpose of having him tried for treason. But upon the decline of the queen's power, he was set at liberty, after an imprisonment of four months; and such was the rapid transition, in those times, from one extreme to another, that in the end of the same year, he was not only restored to his former honours, but appointed one of the privy council to the queen, for the education of the young king and the government of the kingdom. During his imprisonment, an interdict had been laid upon his diocese.[1]

The fourth volume of State Papers, relating to this period, lately published, discloses some curious particulars concerning our archbishop. He had been accused by the English ambassador at the Scottish court, (one Magnus, archdeacon of Reading,) of carrying on a private correspondence with the French, and of receiving emissaries from them, to the prejudice of England. To exculpate himself from this charge, he thus writes to Magnus, from St Andrews, 29th December, 1524:—"And as for the Frenchmen being here in St Andrews, you shall understand that one of

[1] "Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland," p. 9. Printed for the Bannatyne Club.

them came this last St Stephen's day, and others since: I never knew of their coming till the time that they knocked at the gate, I being at dinner in company with the remainder of my lords who are in this town for the time: and I let them in, and treated as accorded, because they had writings forth of France to me and others my lords being here. But they were general, and of old dates. Their galleys came not here, but passed by to the water of Tay."

In a letter of Magnus to Cardinal Wolsey, 9th January 1525, he calls Beaton "the greatest man, both of lands and experience, within this realm:" but he adds, a little farther on in the same letter, that "the said archbishop is noted to be subtle and dissembling. His words have been good, both to Mr Radcliff and me; but the Frenchmen being so long with him, putteth me in doubt what is to be considered for any surety, trust, or fidelity to be found in him." Again: "The said archbishop hath kept a great and solemn Christmas, and with him hath been many lords, both spiritual and temporal. Howbeit, neither have been with him the Earls of Angus, Lennox, nor Argyll; but I hear that some of their servants and counsellors were with him these holydays." Again: "The Archbishop of St Andrews, with his band, is not a little suspect, by occasion of the repairing of the Frenchmen unto him, and for their long continuing at St Andrews, and the good cheer he made unto them, with other considerations before specified. And as to the lords temporal, there is much division among them; and unless it be the Earl of Arran, they are all poor, and of little substance in goods. Here is no justice in this realm, but continual murders, theft, and robbery."

In another letter from the same to the same, dated 24th January, he says, "Of late have been at St

Andrews, with the archbishop there, the Earls of Angus, Lennox, and Argyll, with many others, both spiritual and temporal; and it is said the archbishop there, the Bishop of Aberdeen, the Prior of St Andrews, the said three earls, and many other with them, are combined to take one great part together for the weal, as they say, of the young king their master, and of this his realm, and for a peace to be between England and Scotland." Again: "I understand there hath not been such a house kept in Scotland many days before, as of late the said archbishop hath kept, and yet keepeth; insomuch as at the being with him of these lords, both horse and man, *he gave livery nightly to twenty-one score horses.*"

In the year 1526, Douglas earl of Angus, who had married the queen-mother, had acquired as much power in the state, and as much influence over the person and councils of his youthful sovereign, as his ancestor had done in the reign of James II. The king felt the degradation, and applied secretly to the primate for advice how to emancipate himself from his self-constituted guardian. Beaton recommended the Earl of Lennox to be privately summoned to his assistance, to whom the king communicated his wishes; and, by their united exertions, an army of ten thousand men was speedily raised without the privity of Angus. The latter, however, was not long in discovering the object of this hostile movement; and, by his power at court, and the support of his numerous retainers, found means to collect a counter army, and meet the pressing danger. A sanguinary battle was fought between the two parties at Kirkliston, in the presence of the king, who secretly wished success to the Lennox men, but was under the necessity of seeming to countenance those by whom he was surrounded. The battle, after being long doubtful, ended in the

triumph of the Douglases. Lennox was killed; and the archbishop escaped to the hills of Balgrunno, in Fife, where he put on the disguise of a shepherd, and tended a flock of sheep for three months, in order to conceal himself from his enemies;[1] while, in the meantime, his castle of St Andrews and his abbey of Dunfermline were plundered by the conquerors, Angus himself seizing the archbishop's seal as chancellor, and using it for his own purposes.

Matters were, however, soon accommodated between the primate and the Douglases, on the latter's receiving certain *douceurs* out of the archiepiscopal revenues. Sir Christopher Dacre, in a letter to Lord Dacre, of date 2d December 1526, thus alludes to the transaction in question:—"The Archbishop of St Andrews and they are well agreed, and so he may come to court, if he will; but he will not come there, till he see the court changed of another fashion. The said bishop has given to the Earl of Angus 2000 marks Scots; to George Douglas 1000 marks Scots; to Archibald Douglas 1000 marks Scots; and he has also given to Sir James Hamilton 1000 marks Scots. The Abbot of Arbroath [afterwards Cardinal Beaton] which is kinsman to the Bishop of St Andrews, has lain all the parliament-time in Edinburgh for the fulfilling of this agreement."

When this matter was finally arranged, the primate again took possession of his castle of St Andrews, which he speedily refurnished, and to which he invited the king and the Douglases to spend the Easter holidays of 1528. "There," says Lindsay of Pitscottie, "he made them great banquetting and merriness; and also propined [conciliated] them with great gifts, that

[1] He had run as narrow an escape before, behind the altar of the Blackfriars' church, Edinburgh, in the year 1517, at the time when he was archbishop of Glasgow.—Keith's Catalogue: See of Glasgow.

he might the better pacify their wrath towards him, and obtain their favour. So the king stayed there a while, using hunting and hawking upon the water of Eden; till at the last, the Earl of Angus asked leave to pass to Lothian to see his business; and left with the king, Archibald his father's brother, George his own brother, and James Douglas of Parkhead who was captain of the king's guard. But within two days, Archibald Douglas asked leave of the king to pass to Dundee; and in like manner, George Douglas rode off the town to get his tack performed which had been promised by the bishop to the Earl of Angus; and left with the king, James Douglas of Parkhead, with a hundred gentlemen with him to wait upon the king, where he pleased to pass. But while George Douglas was dressing his business with the bishop, the king passed from St Andrews to Falkland park, to withdraw himself from the Douglases; thinking it was a convenient time to put himself at liberty, and out of their hands, when the Earl of Angus himself, his brother George, and his uncle Archibald, were all out of his company." The result was, that the king, under the pretence of a hunting-match, made his escape in the night from Falkland to Stirling, to which place he summoned his faithful barons, and forbade any of the Douglas family to come within six miles of his person under pain of treason.

In 1529, the king returned to St Andrews with his mother, and a nuncio who had lately come to him from the pope; and "there remained," says Lindsay, "till Michaelmas pardon, and was well entertained by Bishop Beaton, and Prior Patrick Hepburn." While James remained here, Henry VIII. sent to him Barlow, the bishop-elect of St Davids, with sixty gentlemen in his suite, for the purpose of trying to convert him to his new creed, and proposing a personal inter-

view with him at York. Some of these gentlemen had the reputation of being expert archers. The queen-mother, who was an Englishwoman, had been boasting of the superiority of her countrymen at archery, and offered to back them against the Scots. "The king," says the narrative, "hearing of this, was content; and gart her pawn a hundred crowns, and a tun of wine upon the Englishmen's heads; and he incontinent laid down as much for the Scottish men. The field and ground was chosen in St Andrews; and three landed men, and three yeomen chosen to shoot against the Englishmen: to wit, David Wemyss of that ilk, David Arnot of that ilk, and Mr John Wedderburn vicar of Dundee; the yeomen, John Thomson in Leith, Steven Taburner, with a piper called Alexander Bailie. They shot very near, and warred the Englishmen of the enterprise, and wan the hundred crowns and the tun of wine; which made the king very merry, that his men won the victory." The party then reëntered the city, where the victors spent the whole of their prize in entertaining their companions. As to the object of the bishop's mission, it was unsuccessful. He could not only make no impression on the king, but he found all the pulpits closed against him; and, in a letter to Cromwell, he styled James' clerical counsellors "the pope's pestilent creatures, and very limbs of the devil."

In 1533, we again find the archbishop in confinement, though for what reason does not clearly appear. Sir George Lawson thus alludes to the fact, in a letter to Cromwell: "The archbishop of St Andrews is committed to ward in St Andrews castle, in the keeping of the Earl of Rothes: some say, because he will lend the Scottish king no money; and another saying is, because he hath written letters out of the realm, contrary to the king's mind." The Diurnal of Occurrents

adds: "All his servandis are dischargit fra him, exceptand tuelf maist necessar;" but the imprisonment does not seem to have lasted long.

Early in 1536, we find five English noblemen at St Andrews, accompanied by forty equestrians, "quhair thei gat presence of the kingis grace." They remained here twenty days; but what was the precise object of their embassy does not appear.[1]

When James V. came of age, he conceived a great esteem for the primate, and bestowed both on him and his nephew David, (afterwards the celebrated cardinal,) many marks of his favour. The latter was sent, in 1536, to France, to negotiate a marriage between the king and a French princess; and when James himself proceeded thither on the same errand, he left the primate as one of the governors of the kingdom. James, it is well known, took for his first wife Magdalen daughter of the King of France. This union gave some uneasiness to the clergy, that princess having been brought up by her aunt the Queen of Navarre, who was friendly to the Protestants. But their fears on this head soon subsided, as the young queen, who was of a delicate constitution, lived only a few months after her marriage.

Next year, the king sent David Beaton again to France, to propose a marriage with Mary daughter of the Duke of Guise, and widow of the Duke of Longueville; a union fruitful of the beautiful princess who was its only surviving offspring, and of many moral and political consequences to Scotland. Mary was conveyed by a large fleet of ships to Fife, and landed at Balcomie, near Crail, where she was met by her royal bridegroom, and a number of the nobility, by whom she was conducted to the Novum Hospitium in

[1] Diurnal, p. 20.

the priory, which had been fitted up for her reception. After a few days, she was married to James with great pomp, by the primate in his cathedral church. But we must allow Lindsay of Pitscottie to give the account of this lady's arrival and marriage, in his own simple though uncouth style.

"The queen landed in Scotland, at a place called Fifeness, near Balcomy, where she remained till horse came to her. But the king was in St Andrews, waiting upon her home-coming. Then he, seeing that she was landed in such a part, rode forth himself to meet her, with the whole lords, spiritual and temporal, with many barons, lairds, and gentlemen, who were convened for the time at St Andrews in their best array; and received the queen with great honours, and plays made to her. And first, she was received at the New Abbey gate;[1] upon the east side whereof was made to her a triumphant arch by Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, lyon-herald, which caused a great cloud come out of the heavens above the gate, and open instantly, and there appeared a fair lady, most like an angel, having the keys of Scotland in her hands, and delivered them to the queen, in sign and token that all the hearts of Scotland were open to receive her grace; with certain orations and exhortations made by the said Sir David Lindsay to the queen, instructing her to serve her God, obey her husband, and keep her body clean, according to God's will and commandments.

"This being done, the queen was received into her palace, which was called the New Inn,[2] which was

[1] Probably the gate in the abbey wall near the turnpike.

[2] This was the *Novum Hospitium*, one of the priory buildings, on the right hand of the road leading from the Pends to the shore. The gateway is still standing, surmounted with the Royal Arms of Scotland, and those of the priory. There is an empty square for a third shield, which was probably intended for that of the archbishop. This building was the residence of Archbishops Spotswood and Sharp, and was demolished only about forty years ago.

well decored against his coming. Also the bishops, abbots, priors, monks, friars, and canons-regular, made great solemnity in the kirk with masses, songs, and playing of the organs. The king received the queen in his palace to dinner, where was great mirth all day till time of supper.

"On the morn, the queen passed through the town. She saw the Black-friars, the Grey-friars, the old college and the new college, and St Leonard's; she saw the provost of the town, and honest burgesses. But when the queen came to her palace and met with the king, she confessed unto him that she never saw in France, nor in no other country, so many good faces in so little room as she saw that day in Scotland. For she said, it was shown unto her in France, that Scotland was but a barbarous country, destitute and void of all good commodities that used to be in other countries; but now she confessed she saw the contrary; for she never saw so many fair personages of men, women, young babes and children, as she saw that day. At thir words of the queen, the king greatly rejoiced, and said to her, 'Forsooth, madam, you shall see better, please God: ere ye go through Scotland, you shall see many good-like men and women, and other commodities that will be to your contentment.' Then the king remained in St Andrews the space of forty days, with great merriness and game, as jesting, running at the lists, archery, hunting, hawking, with singing, and dancing in maskery, and playing, and all other princely game, according to a king and a queen. And, hereafter, the king departed out of St Andrews to Cowper of Fyfe, and dined there; and syne passed to Falkland, and remained there a while, in hunting of the fallow-deer, seven or eight days. Syne past to Stirling," &c.[1]

[1] Sir D. Lindsay wrote, on this occasion, a satirical poem on "jousting," in which two *medicinars* of the royal household are ludicrously

The queen continued to reside in St Andrews, where, in May 1539, she bore a son to the king. This prince was christened James by the archbishop, "with great triumph," says Lindsay, "as was the use of the countrie," and proclaimed Prince of Scotland and Duke of Rothesay. The godmother was the queen-dowager, and the godfathers, the Archbishop of St Andrews and the Earl of Arran. On this occasion James wrote the following letter to his uncle Henry VIII., the original of which is preserved: "Rycht excellent, Rycht Hie and mychty Prince, oure derrest Bruthir and uncle, we commend us unto you in oure maist hertlie and effectuuse maner. Signifiand unto ye samin yat, sen it hes liket God of His greit gudnes to have send unto ws, yis 22 day of May instant, ane son and prince, fair and lif-lik to succeid to ws and yis our Realme, we think it accordis ws weill to mak you participant with ws of sic joyus gud novellis, and yat we have of oure blude to succeid to yis oure Realme, quhilk may hereftir do plesure to you and yourris. Rycht excellent, Rycht Hie and mychty Prince, oure derrest Bruthir and uncle, we pray ye blissit Trinite, conserve you in lang life and prosperouse stait. Geven under our signete, and subscrivit wicht oure hand, at our abbay of Sanctandrois, the 22 day of May, the 27 zere of oure Regime."

The ensuing winter witnessed an unusual fall of

represented as engaged in a tilting match in presence of the king and queen:

> In Sanct Androis on Whitsoun Monnunday,
> Twa championis their manheid did assay;
> Past to the barres, enarmit heid and handis,
> Was never sene sic justing in na landis,
> In presence of the kingis grace and quene,
> Quhare mony lustie lady micht be sene,
> Mony ane knicht, barroun, and baurent,
> Came for to see that awfull tournament.
> &c. &c. Vol. ii. p. 190.

snow in this place. "It lastit quhill caris Sunday in Lentrone; quhilk tyme thair wes ane infynite of all bestiall deid throw violence of the said storme, mony foullis deit, and mony flockis pariest in snaw."[1]

The queen and her infant son remained a whole year in St Andrews; but, next summer, leaving him here, she went to Stirling, where she was again confined, and delivered of a second son. He was christened Robert, and created Duke of Albany and Earl of Fife and Menteith; but, to the inexpressible grief of the whole country, and especially of the king, who never fully recovered the shock, both his sons became ill, and died within two days of each other, the one at Stirling, the other at St Andrews. They were buried together in the abbey church of Holyrood, and in little more than two years their unhappy father was buried beside them.

During the foregoing episcopate, several persons suffered persecution or death for alleged heresy, the mention of whom I have reserved till now. The first and most eminent of these was Patrick Hamilton abbot of Ferne, a Premonstratensian monastery in Ross-shire. This young man was of noble extraction; and having learned the reformed doctrines from Luther and Melancthon, when in Germany, he fearlessly preached them on his return home. Having been inveigled to St Andrews by the artifices of the priests, means were secretly employed to ascertain the precise opinions which he held. One Campbell, Prior of the Dominican monastery, succeeded in extracting from him a confession of his faith, on the pretext of being himself favourably inclined to the same views; a confession which he afterwards maliciously converted into an accusation against him. On the other hand, one

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 29.

Alexander Aless, a learned canon of the priory, sincerely undertook to reclaim Hamilton; which ended in being himself so much shaken in his faith, that he afterwards quitted St Andrews, and finally became the friend of Melancthon, and professor of divinity in the university of Leipsic. Hamilton, remaining firm, was seized and thrown into the prison of the castle; and, after the necessary preparations were made, he was tried by the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Bishops of Dunkeld, Brechin, and Dumblane, Patrick Hepburn prior of St Andrews, the Abbots of Arbroath, Dunfermline, Cambuskenneth, and Lindores, the Prior of Pittenweem, the Dean and Sub-dean of Glasgow, Hugh Spens the provost of St Salvator's, and other members of the university. Being found guilty of what was then considered heresy, he was sentenced to be burnt before the gate of St Salvator's college. Dr M'Crie, in the Appendix to his Life of Andrew Melville, describes an unsuccessful attempt, on the part of Duncan laird of Airdrie, to save his friend Hamilton from his impending fate. The young laird, who had himself been threatened for the same offence, armed about a score of his tenants and dependants, intending to enter St Andrews by night, and to rescue his friend by carrying him off to a place of safety. But intelligence of his intention having been conveyed to his enemies, his small party was unexpectedly surrounded by a troop of horsemen, and his benevolent design frustrated. Hamilton bore his sufferings with uncommon fortitude; and died commending his soul to God, and beseeching him to dispel the darkness of popery from his native country:[1] and so much sympathy was excited among all who

[1] See, in Appendix XXXIX., a letter from the doctors of the university of Louvaine to the Archbishop of St Andrews, commending him for the execution of Hamilton.

witnessed the scene, that it became afterwards a current saying, that the smoke of Hamilton's flame had infected all on whom it had blown. But one observation may be here made respecting the opinions of the first Protestant martyrs in Scotland: they saw and abhorred the corruptions of Popery, but they confounded the use with the abuse of many of its observances; they were inflamed against prevailing errors rather than prepared to vindicate primitive truth; and they allowed their zeal against Romanism to hurry them on to the destruction of much that was really valuable, the loss of which cannot now be recovered. In short, they had some, but by no means all, of the qualifications of reformers. Not that this is to be wondered at, considering the disadvantages under which they lay; but we ought to keep the fact in mind, that we may not permit our sympathy for them to bespeak an incautious approbation of their whole conduct, or a hasty adoption of all their opinions. They also held some doctrines which very few Protestants of the present day would venture to defend; as, that tithes ought not to be paid to the clergy,—that every faithful man and woman is a priest,—that the unction of kings ceased at the coming of Christ,—that the blessings of bishops are of no value,—that the excommunication of the church is not to be feared,—that in no case is it lawful to swear,—that true Christians receive the body of Christ every day,—that we are no more bound to pray in the church than in other places,—and, that no mortal man can be the visible head of the church. To these, Patrick Hamilton added, "that man hath no free will,—that all good Christians do know that they are in grace,"—and, that "works make us neither good nor evil," and can "neither save nor condemn

us."[1] The story of Hamilton's having denounced, from the stake, a heavy judgment upon Prior Campbell, which afterwards came to pass, rests upon no better authority than the gossip of some persons who lived forty-three years after the event.[2] Anecdotes of this kind owe their currency less to the ground on which they rest than to their being adapted to feed the appetite for the marvellous.

The king's own confessor, Alexander Seaton, a Dominican friar, became infected with the new opinions. On one occasion, while preaching at St Andrews, he introduced some matter into his sermon which favoured the idea of a reformation, not only of the morals of the clergy, but of the doctrines of the church. He also said, that according to the Scriptures, bishops ought to preach, and that they who did not, were idle pastors and dumb dogs. When this was reported to the archbishop, it seemed to point so directly to himself, that he summoned Seaton before him to answer for his language. "Your informers, my lord," said the friar, "must have been very ignorant persons. I said, indeed, that St Paul exhorted bishops to preach, and that the prophet Isaiah called those who did not preach, dumb dogs; but, of my own authority, I said nothing. If that be heresy, Paul and Isaiah are the heretics." This mode of reasoning was not likely to prove satisfactory to the primate. In short, he was under the necessity of leaving Scotland, and seeking shelter in Berwick; from whence he wrote a letter to the king, offering to justify himself, in his presence, before his accusers, if he were allowed a safe-conduct and freedom of speech. Receiving no answer, he proceeded to London, where he became chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk, under whose protection he

[1] Knox, pp. 3, 11, 12, 70.
[2] Fox's Book of Martyrs, vol. ii. p. 228.

remained till his death. About the same time, Gavin Logie, rector of St Leonard's college, and Dr John M'Bee, (who afterwards assisted in translating the Bible into the Danish language,) found it expedient to leave St Andrews on account of their Protestant opinions, and sought refuge on the Continent.

"Within a few years after the martyrdom of Master Patrick Hamilton, one Henry Forrest, a young man born in Linlithgow, who, a little before, had received the orders of Bennet and Collet,[1] as they term them, affirmed and said, that Master Hamilton died a martyr, and that his articles were true; for the which he was apprehended and put in prison by James Beaton archbishop of St Andrews, who, shortly after, caused a certain friar, named Walter Laing, to hear his confession. To whom, when Henry Forrest, in secret confession, had declared his conscience, how he thought Master Patrick to be a good man, and wrongfully put to death, and that his articles were true and not heretical, the friar came and uttered to the bishop the confession that he had heard, which before was not thoroughly known. Whereupon it followed, that his confession being brought as sufficient probation against him, he was therefore convented before the council of the clergy and doctors, and there concluded to be a heretic, equal in iniquity with Master Patrick Hamilton, and there decreed to be given to the secular judges to suffer death. When the day came of his death, and that he should be first degraded, and was brought before the clergy in a green place, being between the castle of St Andrews and another place called Monymail,[2] as soon

[1] There is, probably, an inaccuracy here. He belonged to the "ordo Benedictæ Collette," a devout female of Picardy, who established an order both of monks and nuns in the fifteenth century. I am indebted for this explanation to a Roman Catholic clergyman.

[2] I know not what this "green place" could be; but the bishops of St Andrews had a residence at Monimail, near Cupar in Fife. Probably there is some mistake in the narrative.

as he entered in at the door, and saw the face of the clergy, perceiving whereunto they tended, he cried, with a loud voice, 'Fie a' falsehood! fie a' false friars! revealers of confession: after this day, let no man ever trust any false friars, contemners of God's word, and deceivers of men.' And so, they proceeding to degrade him of his small orders of Bennet and Collet, he said, with a loud voice, 'Take from me not only your own orders, but also your own baptism;' meaning thereby, whatsoever is besides that which Christ himself instituted, whereof there is a great rabblement in baptism.[1] Then, after his degradation, they condemned him as a heretic, equal with Master Patrick aforesaid; and so he suffered death for his faithful testimony of the truth of Christ and of his gospel, at the North Church stile of the abbey church of St Andrews, to the intent that all the people of Angus might see the fire, and so might be the more feared from falling into the like doctrine, which they term by the name of heresy.—*Ex scripto testimonio Scotorum.*"[2]

At this time there were two young men in St Andrews, who afterwards became very celebrated,—studying theology and philosophy under John Major, author of the "De Gestis Scotorum," and Principal of St Salvator's college,—I mean John Knox and George Buchanan, both enrolled on the list of "Scots Worthies." The religious, and still more the political opinions of Major, were of a very questionable character. As to the former, he seems to have been a Protestant in disguise, and therefore not a very consistent Christian. In regard to his politics, "he taught," says Dr M'Crie, who speaks both of himself and his opinions with ap-

[1] It was surely an unguarded speech in this martyr, to desire to be deprived of his Christian baptism; and so the martyrologist seems to have thought, from his endeavour to explain away this part of his address.

[2] Fox, vol. ii. p. 297.

probation,[1] "that the authority of kings and princes were originally derived from the people; that the former are not superior to the latter, collectively considered; that if the rulers become tyrannical, or employ their power for the destruction of their subjects, they may lawfully be controlled by them; and, proving incorrigible, may be deposed by the community as the superior power; and that tyrants may be judicially proceeded against, even to capital punishment. The affinity," he adds, with astonishing coolness, "between these, and the political opinions afterwards avowed by Knox, and defended by the classic pen of Buchanan, is too striking to require illustration." No doubt the affinity is very striking! Buchanan afterwards gave a curious illustration of it, when he caused a naked sword to be represented on the money coined during the minority of James VI., with this very significant motto, *Pro me; si merear, in me.* Knox, too, acted upon the same principle, when he justified the murder of Cardinal Beaton and David Rizzio, deposed the queen-regent of Scotland, and embittered the life of her daughter by his opposition to her person and her religion. The doctrine just amounts to this: that subjects may lawfully depose and murder their sovereign, or any other influential individual, whenever, *in their opinion*, he behaves improperly. This I consider to be a most iniquitous principle of action; unworthy of a heathen, and shocking in a Christian teacher; it is totally repugnant to Scripture, and has been noto-

[1] Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 8. Knox's political opinions may be understood by the following extract from the advertisement to his Second Blast:—"But if they (the people) either rashly have promoted any wicked person, or yet ignorantly have chosen such a one as after declareth himself unworthy of regiment above the people of God, (and such be all idolaters and cruel persecutors,) most justly may the same men depose and punish him whom, unadvisedly, before they did nominate, appoint, and elect."

riously avowed and acted upon by some of the most hardened of infidels, and the worst enemies of mankind.[1] Knox afterwards, shocked apparently at the consequences of his own doctrine, tried to make a metaphysical distinction betwixt "the *authority* which is God's ordinance, and the *persons* of those who are placed in authority:" a distinction without a difference; for how can the authority exist apart from the person who exercises it?[2]

That Major and his pupil Knox should have so long held these opinions unmolested, at the time when many others in the same city were suffering on account of them, is not very easily explained. But Buchanan, who was at this time one of the regents of the university, to the above sentiments, had superadded the offence of composing some satirical verses on the Franciscan friars. The poem was entitled "Franciscanus;" of which this is the argument:—The author supposes that a friend of his is desirous to become a friar; upon which he tells him that he also had had a similar intention, but had been dissuaded from it for reasons which he proceeds to relate. These turn upon the bad morals and conduct, real or imaginary, of those who belonged to the order, as exhibited in the abominable lessons which he puts into the mouth of an ancient monk, the instructor of the novices. He does not ascribe to this man the character of a rough and ignorant priest, but makes him tell his tale cleverly, giving

[1] No consistent member of the Church of England can hold this doctrine, who prays every Sunday, "So rule the heart of thy chosen servant, our king and governor, that we and all his subjects, duly considering *whose authority he hath*, may faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey him, according to thy blessed word and ordinance."

[2] These opinions were, in after times, as we shall see, defended in St Andrews by the well-known Samuel Rutherford. In truth, Buchanan's "De Jure Regni apud Scotos," Knox's "Historie of the Reformation," and Rutherford's "Lex Rex," should occupy the same shelf in every library which contains them.

free vent to every refinement in evil which the age was acquainted with. And all this is done in pure latinity, combined with powerful wit and keen satire. The result was, that, in spite of the efforts of the king to protect the poet, he was seized, and imprisoned in the castle of St Andrews; from which, however, he succeeded fortunately in making his escape, and went abroad. He himself thus writes concerning these persecutions:—"The beginning of the year following, which was 1539, many persons were arrested, as suspected of Lutheranism; and about the end of February, five were burnt, nine recanted, but many more were banished. Among the sufferers of this class was George Buchanan, who, when his keepers were asleep, made his escape out of the window of the prison to which he had been committed."

The primate latterly entrusted the care of ecclesiastical matters, in a great measure, to his nephew the cardinal. We have already seen, that Archbishop A. Stewart had changed the original Pedagogium into a college, and annexed to it the parish church of St Michael of Tarvet; and now the two Beatons, in virtue of a bull which they procured from Paul III. in 1537, dedicated this college to "the blessed Virgin Mary of the Assumption;" and farther endowed it with the great tithes of Tynningham and Tamadice, both in the diocese of St Andrews. This bull still exists in the charter-chest of St Mary's college, and is a beautiful specimen of penmanship.[1] It grants authority to the archbishop to institute a college of presbyters, regents, and scholars, in order "to promote to the degrees of bachelor, licentiate, doctor, or master, those who may be found qualified in knowledge and good morals, in theology, civil and canon law, or

[1] Appendix IV., 2.

any other lawful faculty." It would appear that a sum of money, which Beaton had bequeathed for completing this institution, was applied to a different purpose. The fact is thus alluded to by Lesley:— "This archbishop built, at his own expense, a great part of the college in St Andrews, which is called the New College, and left by will a large sum of money to finish it. But this money was afterwards diverted to other uses, and the college thus defrauded of its right." It was, notwithstanding, carried on, both as to its buildings and constitution, by the cardinal, after he succeeded to the primacy; and, though interrupted by his violent and premature death, was completed, as we shall see in the sequel, by Archbishop Hamilton, his successor.

"Archbishop Beaton," says Spotswood, "a little after he had assisted at the christening of the king's first son, who was born at St Andrews, departed this life; having designed his successors in all the benefits he enjoyed, which were not a few; for, besides the archbishoprick, he possessed the abbacies of Abberbrothic, Dunfermline, and Kilwinning. To his nephew the cardinal, he left St Andrews and Abberbrothic;[2] to George Dury his kinsman, the abbacie of Dunfermline; and to Hamilton of the house of Roplock, the abbacie of Kilwinning. All which the king, for the esteem wherein he held the archbishop whilst he lived, confirmed to them according to his will. He was buried in the abbey church, before the high altar."

This prelate's seal is nearly the same as his predecessor's, excepting the family arms, which are those of Beaton of Balfour, the motto, which is *Misericordia*, and the circumscription which is, "S.J. Beton. archiepi.

[2] It will be seen, under the next episcopate, that the cardinal had got the abbacy of Arbroath some years before this.

Sti. Andree totius regni Scotie primat. ac aplice. sedis legati nati."

With respect to the prior of the monastery during this episcopate, John Hepburn had died in 1522, and was succeeded by his nephew Patrick Hepburn. We have no account of the latter's administration, except that he finished the wall which his uncle had begun. Knox tells a coarse and indecent story of him,[1] which I will not pollute my pages by transcribing. In 1535, he resigned the priorate, on being made Bishop of Moray; where, foreseeing the storm of the Reformation approaching, he feued out the episcopal lands, and thus secured all he could get to himself and his children, of whom he had several. He lived till the year 1573. On his resignation of the priorate, Lord James Stewart, the natural son of James V., succeeded; but as he was a mere child, Alexander Milne abbot of Cambuskenneth was nominated to administer in his name till he came of age. Stewart, as is well known, became a zealous reformer, assisted in plundering and destroying his own monastery, and swept away, in a few years, all that his predecessors had been carefully accumulating and upholding for upwards of four centuries. But of him we shall hear more in the next chapter.

XLIV. David Beaton. A.D. 1539–1546.

This remarkable prelate was the son of John Beaton of Balfour, and Isabel Monypenny, both of the county of Fife. He commenced his education at St Andrews, and completed it at Paris, where he studied civil and canon law. When he had finished his studies, he was directed to remain still in France,

[1] History of the Reformation, p. 15.

in the capacity of envoy from Scotland. During that time he received from his uncle, Archbishop James Beaton, the rectory of Campsie near Glasgow, though then only in what are called the inferior orders of the church, or as he is designated in the gift of presentation, "clericus Sancti Andreæ diocesis."

In 1524, his uncle made over to him, with the concurrence of the pope, the abbacy of Arbroath, but with the reservation to himself of half its revenues during his life.[1] Beaton has been called "the Wolsey of Scotland." He was a great favourite with James V., who made him his Lord Privy Seal, and employed him, as we have seen, on various political occasions. When in France, he had the bishopric of Mirepoix bestowed upon him by the French king; and through the same interest he was raised to the cardinalate in 1538, under the title of "Saint Stephen de cœlio monte." To add to his power, he was made lord chancellor on the death of the king in 1542; and soon after, the pope created him his *legatus à latere*, an office which invested him with unlimited authority in the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland.

When he succeeded to the primacy, he found his hands so full of employment, that, in concurrence with James V., he applied to Pope Paul III. to raise one William Gibson, dean of Restalrig, to the episcopal office, for the purpose of acting as his suffragan, and relieving him in part from the duties of his diocese.[2] To this request the pope acceded, and made Gibson "bishop of Libaria in partibus infidelium," with full power to act in behalf of the primate when required.

"The first act of the cardinal," says Archbishop Spotswood, "after his promotion to the see of St Andrews, did show what an enemy he would be to

[1] Appendix XXXVIII. [2] Appendix XL.

those who were at that time called heretics; for he was not well warmed in his seat, when, to make his greatness seen, he brought to St Andrews, the Earls of Huntly, Arran, Marshal, and Montrose; the Lords Fleming, Lindsay, Erskine, Somerville, Torphichen, and Seaton, with divers others, barons and men of rank. There came thither also, Gawin archbishop of Glasgow, chancellor; the Bishops of Aberdeen, Galloway, Brechin, and Dumblane; the Abbots of Melrose, Dunfermline, Culross, Paisley, Lindores, and Kinlosie, with a number of deans and doctors of theologie." Among these were Alexander Balfour vicar of Kilmany and rector of the university; John Wynram, subprior; John Amand and Thomas Cuningham, canons-regular of St Andrews; John Major, author of the "De Gestis Scotorum"; John Tulidaffe warden of the Franciscan, and John Thomson prior of the Dominican monastery. "And they all having convened in the cathedral church, the cardinal, sitting on a chair erected somewhat above the rest, began to expose the dangers wherein the Catholic faith stood, by the increase of heretics, and the boldness they took to profess their opinions openly, even in the king's court, where, he said, they found too great countenance."

It was before this assembly, that Sir John Borthwick was cited to appear on an accusation of heresy. There were thirteen articles exhibited against him, one of which was, that "the heresies, commonly called the heresies of England, were commendable, and to be embraced of all Christians." This is a proof that a few, at least, of our first Reformers were friendly to the English episcopacy, had not covetousness in some, and ignorance combined with fanaticism in others, interposed to hinder that system from being established in Scotland. But though cited, Sir John was too

cautious to appear in person; and for non-appearance was condemned and excommunicated, his goods confiscated, and his effigy burnt at the market-cross of the city. The following is a copy of his entire sentence;[1] "Therefore we David, of the title of St Stephen de cœlio monte, cardinal-priest of the holy Roman Church, Archbishop of St Andrews, Primate of this whole realm of Scotland, and *legatus natus* of the apostolic see, sitting in our seat of justice, the holy Evangelist of God set before us, that our judgments proceed from the sight of God, and our eyes must look to equity, having only God and the Catholic faith before us, the name of God being called upon and following the counsel as well of the divines as the lawyers, the foresaid John Borthwick, called Captain Borthwick, condemned of the foresaid heresies, accused, suspected, and infamed by lawful probations had and brought against him in all the foresaids, convicted, cited, called, and not appearing, but absenting himself like a runaway; therefore let us think, pronounce, and declare him to be convicted, and to be punished worse than a heretic. And furthermore, all his moveables and unmoveables, by whatsoever title they be gotten, and in whatsoever parts they lie, to be given to the secular power. And all offices had by dower or by his wife, to be confiscate and spent to the use and custom of the law. Also we do declare by these presents, the image of the foresaid John to be made to the likeness of him, and to be brought into the metropolitan church of St Andrews, and after that, to the market-cross of the city, there to be burnt as a sign and memorial of his condemning, to the example and fear of all others. Likewise we do declare, that if the same John be taken within our liberties, he be

[1] Hall's Chronicle, p. 815.

punished according to the law of heretics. Also, we warn all true believers in Christ, of whatsoever state and condition they be, that they from this day, do not receive or admit into their houses, tents, villages, or towns, John Borthwick to eat or to drink, or to prefer any kind of humanity; on pain of such like punishment. Farther, if there be any found culpable in these foresaids, they shall be accused as fautors and maintainers of heretics, and shall be punished according to the law. This sentence read and made and put in writing in the metropolitan church of St Andrews, we sitting on our tribunal seat, the year of our Lord 1540, the 28th day of May, drawn out of the register made against heretics, and agreeing with the sentence of John Borthwick."

Sir John, in order to escape from the execution of the foregoing sentence, took refuge at the court of Henry VIII., where he was protected, and where he wrote and published a long defence of his opinions.[1]

In 1540, we find the king of England, through the medium of his ambassador, Sir Ralph Sadler, attempting to prejudice the mind of James V. against the cardinal, and to persuade him to treat that churchman as he had himself treated his own Cardinal Wolsey. But the attempt proved a failure. James not only set a high value on the cardinal's services, but saw through the selfish design of Henry in trying to depreciate them. Sir Ralph gives a long account, in a letter to his master, of the unscrupulous means he used to gain his end, and finishes with these words.

[1] Fox's Martyrs, vol. ii. p. 605. After the Reformation the sentence against Borthwick was reversed, and the reversal pronounced, "in the consistoriall hows, within the paroche kyrk of the citie of Sanctandrois, upon the 5th day of September, in the yeir of God, MVLXI. years," by one of the very persons who had assisted at his condemnation, namely John Wynram, who had then become Superintendent of Fife. See the Bannatyne Miscellany, vol. i. p. 260.

"I assure your Majesty, he excused the cardinal in everything, and seemed wondrous loath to hear of anything that should sound as an untruth in him, but rather gave him great praise."

Henry next renewed his endeavour to obtain a personal interview with James, and was so far led to expect one, that he set out for the express purpose of meeting him at York, where he waited a whole week in daily expectation of his arrival. But the cardinal, who dreaded this conference, lest it might affect the stability, or even lead to the overthrow of Romanism in Scotland, dissuaded James from complying with his uncle's request. James, therefore, despatched a messenger to York, to express his regret that he was detained at home by urgent business; a message, which not only highly provoked the impetuous Henry, but led him to declare immediate war against Scotland, as he now despaired of gaining his end by any other means.

James died the following year, leaving an infant heiress to the throne, only a few days old. At the same time, the disgraceful discomfiture of the Scottish army at Solway threw a number of their leaders into the hands of Henry, who found means, before he allowed them to return home again, to gain them over to his interests. Among these were the Earls of Glencairn and Cassillis, the Lords Maxwell, Somerville, Gray, Oliphant, and Fleming, and the Master of Erskine, besides some gentlemen of inferior rank. These men undertook, in return for their liberty, and for stipulated pensions, (in conjunction with the Earl of Angus, and his brother Sir George Douglas, who had been for some years living in banishment at the English court,) to forward Henry's views as to a change of religion, and also in bringing about a marriage betwixt his son Edward and their infant queen,

Mary; three most important articles of the treaty being,—that he should, in the meantime, have the charge of the infant queen's person and education,—be put in possession of the chief fortresses in Scotland,—and enjoy the title of "Protector of Scotland," with power to appoint a local regent to act under his directions. This was virtually handing over the government of Scotland to the King of England, a measure to which, we may safely assert, no patriotic Scotsman would, on any terms, have consented. It had long been a favourite object with Henry to unite the two kingdoms under one of his own family; and he justly enough considered, that uniformity of religion would promote and cement this political union. Twenty-five years before, he had used his endeavours to effect this object by betrothing his daughter Mary to his nephew James of Scotland; but that measure having failed, he was now doubly anxious to avail himself of the only remaining chance he had of accomplishing this design. Henry, therefore, in liberating his prisoners, laid them under personal obligations to promote his object in regard to the union of the crowns. But, when they returned to Scotland, they found the cardinal and the church party so strong, and the feeling against England so general, that they dared not venture to divulge the terms which they were pledged to propose: and hence their first step was to persuade the governor, Arran, a weak man whom they had gained to their interests, to seize the person of Beaton, and throw him into the prison of Blackness, on the pretext that he had been engaged in a treasonable correspondence with France. But one consequence of this they had not calculated upon: the whole country was laid under a religious interdict by the cardinal's order, the public services of the church were discontinued, and the priests refused to

bury the dead or to administer the sacraments, "except them the governor gart serve on force."[1] But the governor soon after began to open his eyes to the real character and objects of Henry, moved, it is supposed, by the arguments or persuasions of his half-brother John Hamilton abbot of Paisley. He was thus led to believe that it would be most for the advantage of Scotland to give the cardinal his freedom, and to join with him in opposing the ambitious projects of the English monarch. At the same time, not willing to break suddenly with the latter and his agents, he commanded the Lord Seaton to remove Beaton from Blackness to his own castle of St Andrews, to allow him the free range of that fortress, and to place a guard of fifteen soldiers over him; knowing that he had three hundred soldiers of his own in the same place, and the whole city at his devotion besides. The consequence was, that the cardinal soon regained his liberty, and in the month of May openly held a meeting of his bishops and clergy in the cathedral. At this meeting the utmost indignation was displayed against England and her artifices; resolutions were made to call on the nation to support the Church; and those present declared their willingness not only to sacrifice their private fortunes in the cause, but, if necessary, to melt down the church plate, and even fight personally for their religion and independence.

Here the vacillating and uncertain character of the governor again showed itself. He arrived at St Andrews in the following August; and though he had connived at the cardinal's escape from confinement, yet now, because the latter did not come out from his castle to meet him, became, or affected to become, highly offended, and even caused him to be proclaimed a

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 26.

rebel at the cross of the city. But, after a few days, he suddenly departed to Callendar House, the seat of Lord Livingstone, where he was secretly joined by the cardinal, and all differences amicably settled between them. He abjured the Protestant faith, which he had embraced, and delivered up his eldest son to the custody of Beaton, to reside with him in the castle of St Andrews, as a pledge of his sincerity.

In Sadler's State Papers are some curious conversations between himself, Sir G. Douglas, and the governor, concerning the imprisonment and liberation of the cardinal; but there is so much intrigue and double-dealing manifested throughout, among all concerned, that one has a difficulty in unravelling the plot, and no satisfaction in dwelling upon its details. Though the governor was probably a party to the liberation of his prisoner, he succeeded in persuading the ambassador that he was not; and the better to keep up the deception, was not openly reconciled to him till some months after. Certain it is, however, that the cardinal, from having been the governor's close prisoner in Blackness castle, in January, 1543, became, in the course of eight months, master of the governor himself, custodier of the infant queen's person, and the most powerful man in the kingdom, in spite of every effort on the part of the King of England, his talented ambassador, and a large portion of the Scottish nobility, to destroy both his person and his influence. But the feeling of the country was strongly in favour of its independence of England, and that materially contributed to his success.

Henry, finding himself thus foiled in the art of secret negotiation, determined again to try what he could accomplish by open warfare. The instructions he issued to the Earl of Hertford, the general of the army destined for the invasion of Scotland, betray a

ferocity of disposition scarcely to be paralleled even in that barbarous age. He directed him to "burn Edinburgh town, and raze the castle, *putting man, woman, and child to fire and sword*, where any resistance shall be made against you. And this done, pass over to the Fifeland, and extend like extremities and destruction to all towns and villages whereunto you may reach conveniently; not forgetting, amongst all the rest, so to spoil and turn upside down the *cardinal's town of St Andrews*, as the upper stone may be the nether, and not one stick stand by another; *sparing no creature alive within the same*, specially such as either in friendship or blood be allied to the cardinal. And if you see any likelihood to win the castle, give some stout essay to the same; and if it be your fortune to get it, raze and destroy it piecemeal; and after this sort, spending one month there, spoiling and destroying as aforesaid," &c.[1] Happily the English general never got so far as St Andrews; but in the course of that and the following summer, he succeeded (owing, in a great measure, to the perfidy of the Scots who were in the interest of England) in destroying life and property to a vast extent; laying waste the Merse, Teviotdale, and the Lothians, the whole of Edinburgh except the castle, Leith, Haddington, Dunbar, and some seaports in Fife, eight monasteries, twenty castles, ten market towns, eight hospitals, and upwards of three hundred villages, besides immense stores of grain, and multitudes of cattle,—all under the plea of helping on the cause of reformation, and uniting the two monarchies into one!

Meanwhile Henry, finding that Beaton was the grand obstacle to the accomplishment of his ambitious projects, had entered into a conspiracy for his private

[1] Chalmers' Life of Queen Mary, vol. i. p. 407.

assassination. The chief persons engaged in organizing this conspiracy were the Earls of Cassillis, Glencairn, Marshal, and Sir George Douglas; while the individuals fixed upon for carrying it into execution were the two Lesleys, (brother and eldest son of the Earl of Rothes,) Kirkaldy of Grange, Crichton of Brunstone, Henry Balnevis, Peter Carmichael, James Melville, and George Wishart. Of the latter body, some were the personal enemies of the cardinal, who were glad of the opportunity of revenge; some were mercenary wretches, who were ready to execute any villany for money; and others, I regret to add, were reforming preachers, who, misled by the false maxims of the age, persuaded themselves that the desired *end* of the cardinal's death would justify any *means* that could be employed in effecting it. The particulars of this conspiracy and George Wishart's concern in it, I have detailed in the Appendix. Whether Beaton were aware of its existence cannot be known with certainty. Probably he was not; for the affair was kept a profound secret, and has only of late years come to light; but he could not fail to see that Wishart was the bosom friend of his avowed enemies, and a most zealous and successful propagator of the new opinions. In fact, the part which that popular preacher was employed to act, was to perambulate the midland counties of Scotland, denouncing Popery and the Romish bishops, under the armed protection of the principal conspirators; and sometimes taking upon himself to *prophesy* what was to happen, which, from his private knowledge of King Henry's plans, and of the conspirators' intentions, he often announced with an accuracy which made him afterwards to be regarded as inspired. Under these circumstances, Beaton determined to have him arrested, and tried on a charge of heresy, which he knew, as the law then stood, he

could have no difficulty in substantiating. Accordingly, he got the governor of Scotland to send a party of horse, under the command of the Earl of Bothwell,[1] in the beginning of the year 1546, into East Lothian, where he was staying with some of the conspirators. At the house of one of them, the famous John Knox was then living, in the capacity of tutor to his sons; a fact which, taken in connexion with what occurred afterwards, affords suspicions of that reformer's knowledge of the plot. Wishart had just parted from his friend Knox, and reached the house of Ormiston, when Bothwell appeared, and, in the governor's name, demanded possession of his person. Ormiston at first refused to surrender his friend, and only consented on Bothwell's promising that his life should be spared; a promise which he had no authority to give, and could not, therefore, keep. As soon as Wishart was secured, he was sent to St Andrews, and placed under the charge of the cardinal himself, who hastened his trial, that no contingency might occur to deprive him of the opportunity he now had of getting rid of this formidable enemy to himself and his church. When the day of trial came, Wynram the sub-prior preached the opening sermon; after which the articles were exhibited and read over. They related to the usual topics of dispute between the Romanists and the Reformers: auricular confession, monastic vows, the authority of the pope, the marriage of priests, payment of tithes, prayers to the saints, and ordination. Wishart did not deny that, however some of his sentiments on these points had been misrepresented, he held and had taught opinions at variance with those of the Church of Rome. This was enough. He was condemned by his judges to be burnt at the stake. Next morning, the bishop

[1] Appendix to the Epist. Reg. Scotiæ, p. 342.

sent two friars to acquaint him that he must prepare for immediate death, and to ask him if he were disposed for confession. He requested to see the subprior, who accordingly came and conversed with him for some time. He then asked to be permitted to receive the communion in both kinds; but this was refused. On the morning of his execution, before quitting the castle, and while at *breakfast* with the captain and his family, he took on himself, though not in holy orders, to consecrate some bread and wine, and to administer the sacrament of the Lord's supper, first to himself, and afterwards to those around him. In this he, no doubt, acted consistently with one of the opinions he had avowed on his trial,—that all Christians, being "made kings and *priests* unto God," are all equally competent to exercise the priestly office, though not ordained.[1] Immediately after this, he was led to the place of execution, in front of the castle, where he surveyed the implements of death with apparent composure, and endured his sufferings with astonishing fortitude. This happened on the first of March 1546.

The ecclesiastical historian Collier has some very judicious observations on the circumstances of Wishart's execution, which I will here transcribe; premising only that he was wholly unacquainted with the private conspiracy against Beaton, and of course therefore with the part which Wishart had taken in promoting it. "His design, as far as may be guessed by his practice, was to recover the people from error, and put them in a safer way to eternal happiness. Notwithstanding this, he was not without a mixture of mistake and disadvantage. For, not to mention his preaching without a canonical authority, his con-

[1] On the same ground he might have argued, that every man was a *king*.

secrating the eucharist and exercising the most solemn part of the sacerdotal function, looks wholly indefensible. He is charged, on his trial, with usurping the priest's office without authority. He does not deny the fact, but excuseth himself by maintaining that all Christians are priests; and that, by consequence, there is no distinction between laity and clergy. This principle is both repugnant to holy Scripture, and destructive of all spiritual society. For, as the State cannot subsist, if every man should meddle with the government, and pretend a right to make himself a magistrate; so neither can the Church go on, where the privileges of the hierarchy are invaded and made common. The bishops and priests are spiritual magistrates; and unless their privileges are guarded and their powers unencroached, the body will be dissolved of course, and everything fall into confusion; for without distinction between the governors and governed, the being of any society is impracticable. Farther, Wishart pretended to the gift of prophecy, but worked no miracles to prove his claim either to that distinction or to the office of the priesthood. Now, how far purity of intention, the spirit of martyrdom, and resigning to death and torture for conscience' sake, which seems to have been Wishart's case,—how far this may atone for human frailties, and breaking through the discipline of the Church, I shall not take upon me to determine; but from the mercies of God, we have reason to hope the best. But then, no fervency of devotion, no advantage of character, ought to justify an error, or set up miscarriage for a precedent. On the other side, the prosecuting of this person to the stake, was an instance of an excessive and unwarrantable rigour, and was looked on as a barbarity, even in a heathen magistracy; and how these sanguinary methods were

disliked by the ancient Church, I have shown in the first part of this work."

Immediately after Wishart's execution, the cardinal set out on a journey to Findhaven, for the purpose of marrying his daughter to the Master of Crawford. The bride received a dower of 1000 marks sterling from her father; and the ceremony is represented to have been performed in a style of uncommon magnificence. He then returned to St Andrews in order to strengthen the fortifications of his castle against another threatened attack from his implacable enemy Henry VIII.

Meanwhile the conspirators were not idle. Either trembling for their own fate, if discovered, or anxious to be revenged for the death of their friend Wishart, they resolved to delay no longer the execution of their plot; and having succeeded in gaining admission into the castle of St Andrews, they murdered the cardinal on the 29th May, 1546. The following is Tytler's eloquent account of this bloody deed:—"On the evening of the 28th May, Norman Lesley came, with only five followers, to St Andrews, and rode, without exciting suspicion, to his usual inn. William Kirkaldy of Grange was there already, and they were soon joined by John Lesley, who took the precaution of entering the town after night-fall, as his appearance, from his known enmity to Beaton, might have raised alarm. Next morning at day-break, the conspirators assembled in small detached knots in the vicinity of the castle; and the porter having lowered the drawbridge to admit the masons employed in the new works, Norman Lesley, and three men with him, passed the gates, and inquired if the cardinal was yet awake? This was done without suspicion; and as they were occupied in conversation, James Melville, Kirkaldy of Grange, and their followers, entered unnoticed;

but on perceiving John Lesley who followed, the porter instantly suspected treason, and, springing to the drawbridge, had unloosed its iron fastening, when the conspirator Lesley anticipated his purpose by leaping across the gap. To despatch him with their daggers, cast the body into the fosse,[1] and seize the keys of the castle, employed but a few minutes: and all was done with such silence as well as rapidity, that no alarm had been given. With equal quietness the workmen who laboured on the ramparts were led to the gate and dismissed. Kirkaldy, who was acquainted with the castle, then took his station at a private postern, through which alone any escape could be made; and the rest of the conspirators going successively to the apartments of the different gentlemen who formed the prelate's household, awoke them, and threatening instant death if they spoke, led them one by one to the outer wicket, and dismissed them unhurt. In this manner, a hundred workmen and fifty household servants were disposed of by a handful of men, who, closing the gates and dropping the portcullis, were complete masters of the castle. Meanwhile, Beaton, the unfortunate victim, against whom all this hazard had been encountered, was still asleep; but awakening, and hearing an unusual bustle, he threw on a night-gown, and drawing up the window of his bedchamber, inquired what it meant? Being answered that Norman Lesley had taken the castle, he rushed to the private postern, but seeing it already guarded, returned speedily to his own apartment, seized his sword, and, with the assistance of his page, barricaded the door on the inside with his heaviest furniture. John Lesley now coming up, demanded admittance. 'Who are you?' said the cardinal.

[1] This was as much a murder as that of the cardinal himself.

'My name,' he replied, 'is Lesley.'—'Is it Norman?' asked the unhappy man, remembering probably the bond of manrent.[1] 'I must have Norman, he is my friend.'—'Nay, I am not Norman,' answered the ruffian, 'but John; and with me ye must be contented.' Upon which he called for fire, and was about to apply it to the door, when it was unlocked from within. The conspirators now rushed in, and Lesley and Carmichael throwing themselves furiously upon their victim, who earnestly implored mercy, stabbed him repeatedly. But Melville, a milder fanatic, ('a man,' says Knox, 'of nature most gentle and most modest,') who professed to murder, not from passion, but from religious duty, reproved their violence. 'This judgment of God,' said he, 'ought to be executed with gravity, although in secret;' and presenting the point of his sword to the bleeding prelate, he called on him to repent of his wicked courses, and especially of the death of the holy Wishart, to avenge whose innocent blood they were now sent by God. 'Remember,' said he, 'that the mortal stroke I am now about to deal, is not the mercenary blow of a hired assassin, but the just vengeance which hath fallen on an obstinate and cruel enemy of Christ and the holy gospel.' On saying this, he repeatedly passed his sword through the body of his unresisting victim, who sunk down from the chair to which he had retreated, and instantly expired. The alarm had now risen in the town; the common bell was rung; and the citizens, with their provost, running in confused crowds to the side of the fosse, demanded admittance, crying out that they must instantly speak with my Lord Cardinal. They were answered from the battlements that it would be better for them to disperse, as he

[1] Norman Lesley had granted a bond of manrent to the cardinal for the estate of Easter Wemyss.

whom they called for could not come to them, and would not trouble the world any longer. This, however, only irritated them the more, and being urgent that they would speak with him, Norman Lesley reproved them as unreasonable fools who desired an audience of a dead man; and dragging the body to the spot, hung it by a sheet over the wall, naked, ghastly, and bleeding from its recent wounds. 'There,' said he, 'there is your god; and now ye are satisfied, get you home to your houses:' a command which the people instantly obeyed. Thus perished Cardinal David Beaton, the most powerful opponent of the reformed religion in Scotland—by an act which some authors, even in the present day, have scrupled to call murder. To these writers, the secret and long-continued correspondence with England was unknown; a circumstance perhaps to be regretted, as it would have saved some idle and angry reasoning. By its disclosure, we have been enabled to trace the secret history of those iniquitous times; and it may now be pronounced, without fear of contradiction, that the assassination of Beaton was no sudden event, arising simply out of indignation for the fate of Wishart; but an act of long projected murder, encouraged, if not originated, by the English monarch, and, so far as the principal conspirators were concerned, committed from private and mercenary motives."[1]

According to Sir James Balfour, the cardinal's body, after lying some time in salt, in the sea-tower of the castle, was privately buried in the convent of the Black friars, St Andrews. In all probability it lies

[1] Tytler's History of Scotland, vol. v. p. 426, and Appendix; also the Appendix to his Life of Sir Thomas Craig; and State Papers, vol. v. In the summons of treason and murder against Beaton's enemies, dated July, 1546, no less than thirty-five persons are mentioned by name as being implicated. See Appendix to the Epistolæ Regum Scotiæ, p. 347. It was considered treason to slay a chancellor.

in what is now the play-ground of the Madras school, a few yards east from the ruined chapel where the choir was situated, which we know was the usual burying-place of persons of distinction.

I have never seen a seal of Cardinal Beaton's; but one of the documents in the Appendix[1] is the confirmation of a deed by him, in which his designation runs thus: "David, miseratione divina, Sti. Stephani in cœlio monte de urbe Stæ. Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyter cardinalis, Sti. Andreæ archiepiscopus, totius regni Scotiæ primas, et apostolicæ sedis legatus natus, Mirapecensis ecclesiæ in Gallia administrator, ac commendatarius perpetuus monasterii de Ardbroth."

In the Advocates' Library is a thick folio MS. volume, entitled "Rentale Sancti Andree," or book of accounts of the archbishopric, extending from 1539 to 1545. It contains charges and discharges by Archibald Beaton, the "granitarius," and Alexander Kinnymonth, the "camerarius" of the cardinal; which more resemble the receipts and disbursements of a prince than of a prelate.

Cardinal Beaton's moral character has been as much mangled by Knox, Buchanan, and Sir D. Lindsay, as his body was by his assassins. The unproved assertions of avowed enemies can be of no weight against any man, and would be rejected in every court of justice. It has been asserted, or hinted, that he poisoned his master, and forged his will; that he had an intrigue with the queen; that he caused, or endeavoured to cause, various murders to be committed; and that he kept numerous mistresses: but they who bring these charges against him, betray so much hatred of the man, that, without more evidence than they have ever yet produced, they cannot be credited. The charges

[1] Appendix III. 2.

were never raised till after his death; they are often absurd and contradictory; and they are strenuously denied by his admirers, Lesley, Winzet, and Burne, who are fully as worthy of credit as his enemies.[1] For these reasons, I think it unnecessary to enter upon a formal investigation of them. The accusations and the denials may be considered as neutralizing each other; and, for the facts themselves, we have scarcely sufficient evidence from history to decide upon them positively. As to Beaton's mistresses, the number would appear to be immense, if we could trust the peasantry of Forfarshire, who point out half the towers in their county as having been the residences of these ladies. With respect to Marion Ogilvy, (daughter of the first Lord Ogilvy of Airley,) according to Douglas's Peerage, she is "said to have been married to David Bethune, younger son of the laird of Balfour, in Fife, afterwards Archbishop of St Andrews, and by him

[1] See a Gratulatorius Panegyricus on Beaton by Archibald Hay, who was Principal of St Mary's College, in 1547. The panegyric was addressed to Beaton himself, probably in the year 1539. While the author does not spare the errors of the times, and the ignorance as well as defective morals which prevailed among many of the clergy at that period, he speaks in the warmest terms of the cardinal. He dwells on the excellent instruction and example he had received from his parents; the rapid progress he made in his education at Paris, "praeclarissimam orbis terrarum Academiam," to which he went at the age of sixteen, and where he remained ten years; the early friendship which the Regent Duke of Albany, the young king, and his uncle the archbishop, conceived for him; the skill he employed in negotiating the king's two marriages; the regard entertained for him by the king and the nobility of France; the flattering manner in which the pope bestowed upon him the cardinalate; and, lastly, his carrying on the improvement and endowment of St Mary's college, which his old uncle, from his procrastinating disposition, (as Hay alleges,) had too long delayed. He ends with reminding him of his responsibilities, and how much his conduct and example would influence his countrymen for good or for evil. "Ecclesiasticorum omnium in regno Scotiæ mores a te pendent; ut si quid peccent, rationem reddas Christo cujus vicem geris in ea regione, utinam quam felicissime et maxime bonorum omnium proventu . . . . . statutum necesse est habeas, vitam citius perdere quam a Christo deficere."

had several children, *before he entered into holy orders*." It is well known that, in the Roman Church, there are what are termed "inferior orders" below the rank of deacon; such as, acolytes, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers. Persons in these orders may marry; but, if advanced to the superior orders, are obliged to relinquish their wives.[1] "They are certainly mistaken who suppose that all the children of clergymen in times of popery were illegitimate."[2] Margaret Beaton, the issue of the aforesaid marriage, was married to the Master (afterwards the eighth earl) of Crawford, by whom she had four sons and one daughter, the eldest of which sons was the lineal ancestor of the Earls of Crawford and Lindsay: and it is not very probable that the Ogilvies would have sanctioned a connexion between one of their daughters and an unmarried priest, however eminent his rank; or the Lindsays, between one of their sons and his daughter. I say thus much in justice to the memory of one against whom there exists a strong and almost universal prejudice, but whom, surely, we ought not to censure farther than as we are warranted by well authenticated facts. "The impartial justice of posterity," as it is called, has dealt with the memory of Beaton as it has done with that of his successor Archbishop Sharp; and to this sentence we might be inclined to bow, were it not that *tradition* is too slender a foundation on which to build a superstructure of condemnation and calumny.

[1] Carruthers, in his History of Queen Mary's Reign, p. 41, says—"The cardinal was a widower previous to his entering into holy orders;" and this is the more likely from his having remained at the university of Paris till he was twenty-six years old. I imagine, indeed, he was not in deacon's orders till the two years expired after his obtaining the abbacy of Arbroath, and his returning from France in 1526, at which time he was twenty-eight. See Appendix XXXVII.

[2] Johnson's "Clergyman's Vade Mecum," p. 93.

CHAP. X.

Life and Times of John Hamilton archbishop of St Andrews, from his succession in 1546, *till the Reformation in* 1560.

This prelate was the natural son of James, the first Earl of Arran, and thus half-brother of the second earl, who was Governor of Scotland. He had been educated at the university of Glasgow, but was much in France in his early life. During his abode there, he was made Abbot of Paisley, *in commendam;* and, on his return home in 1543, he was created Lord High Treasurer, and Bishop of Dunkeld, from which see he was translated to St Andrews, after the murder of the cardinal.

The first occurrence to which our attention must be called in this episcopate, is the behaviour of the conspirators in the castle of St Andrews. To enable them to keep possession of this important fortress, Henry VIII. liberally supplied them with money, military stores, and provisions, and with the assistance of six vessels, under the command of Admiral Tyrrell. Arran the governor, in the meantime, collected an army, and besieged them, notwithstanding that his eldest son, who had been residing with the cardinal at the time of his assassination, had fallen into their hands, and was threatened with death, if any undue severity were exercised against them. Their ally, King Henry, was also desirous of getting rid of this youth, because he knew there had been a project for marrying him to the young Queen of Scots, which, if carried into effect, would have completely overturned his long-cherished scheme of securing that princess for his own son Ed-

ward. But, in this respect, the governor acted with great disinterestedness; for he announced to the conspirators that, as he had other sons whom he could make his heirs, he was not to be deterred from doing his duty, through any fear of violence which they might exercise towards the one who was in their power.[1] And not only so, but he declared them guilty of high treason, forfeited their estates, and used every effort to take the castle from them: the clergy taxing themselves in the sum of £2000 monthly to enable him to succeed.

But, after four months of ineffectual warfare, the garrison was admitted to terms of temporary accommodation; it being settled, *first*, that the governor should procure for the besieged a sufficient absolution from the pope for the slaughter of the cardinal; *secondly*, that neither the besieged, nor any one belonging to them, should be prosecuted at law for the said slaughter; and, *thirdly*, that the garrison should give pledges for surrendering the castle, as soon as the absolution should come from Rome; they, in the meantime, retaining possession of the governor's son.

It may give us some idea either of the skill of the besieged, or the want of it in the besiegers, when we are told that the governor had divided the whole military force of the country into four parts, and brought up each in succession for four months together, yet without making much impression upon the castle. But it is to be considered, that the late cardinal had made the fortifications very strong, in anticipation of an attack from England; and, moreover, that the governor's efforts were paralyzed by the treason of some of his

[1] This youth was afterwards recovered, unhurt, when the castle was taken.

own people who were in Henry's pay, though he was not aware of it at the time.[1]

But the truce did not last long. The pardon came from the pope; but it was so fettered, that it seemed to withdraw with one hand what it granted with the other: "remittimus crimen irremissibile," we pardon this unpardonable crime. For this and other reasons, the siege was renewed early in the year 1547, with a considerable force, and two uncommonly large cannons, nicknamed *Crook-mow* and *Deaf-meg*. "But," says Lindsay of Pitscottie, "after three months' siege, the pest arising in the town, the governor was constrained to leave his purpose without effect. Hereby those who were in the castle became exceedingly insolent, and oppressed all the country about, with spoiling of goods, and ravishing of women, notwithstanding of the manifold admonitions of sundry godly men who were with them, and foretold them of that which came to pass thereafter." One of the "godly men" here referred to, was, I presume, John Rough; and to him we may, perhaps, add Sir David Lindsay, and Henry Balnevis, if "godliness" be estimated by zeal against Popery. Rough had been originally a Dominican monk, and, after his conversion, became Protestant chaplain to the Governor of Scotland; but when that nobleman returned to his first religion, he joined the conspirators in the castle of St Andrews. Finding that his discourses produced no impression upon that graceless band, he confined his sermons chiefly to the parish church of the city, where, under the protection of his friends in the castle, he held public disputations with the Romish clergy on the points at issue between them and the Reformers. But for this protection, we may be sure he would not have been safe from persecution.

[1] See Appendix XLIII., and "Diurnal of Occurrents in Scotland," pp. 42, 43.

when we remember that Wishart had been burnt only one year before, and that Walter Mill was burnt in the same city eleven years after, for maintaining the very same doctrines.[1]

At this time, King Henry VIII. died; but that produced no change in the policy of the English cabinet. The Protector Somerset immediately concluded a treaty with the murderers in the castle, by which they bound themselves to forward the marriage between Edward and Mary, and to deliver up the castle to English commissioners as soon as the marriage should be solemnized. He, in return, confirmed the pensions to each of the chiefs, and engaged to send half-yearly pay to a garrison of one hundred and twenty men.

At Easter 1547, John Knox arrived at St Andrews, and entered into the castle with his three pupils, Francis and George Douglas, sons of the laird of Langniddry, and Alexander Cockburn, eldest son of the laird of Ormiston—a singular society to select for the example and instruction of his youthful disciples! In acting thus, besides, he not only abetted the crimes of murder and treason, but he acted in direct contravention of an order issued some months before by the governor in council, and proclaimed at the market-cross of St

[1] Rough, however, did not escape in the end. He afterwards retired to England, got a benefice near Hull from the Archbishop of York, and suffered martyrdom under Queen Mary, because (among other things laid to his charge) "he had read, in some places where the godly people were assembled, the prayers of the communion-book set forth in the reign of King Edward." It may be curious to read the character of this Reformer by Dempster: "John Rough, an impious and vile apostate, fled from the holy community of the Dominicans out of Scotland into England; where, after his order had been abolished by Edward VI., this herald of Satan married a wife, with whom he criminally lived, until, being drawn out from the shades of impiety, under the government of the most pious Queen Mary, he was brought into the open day of infamy, and atoned in the flames for the violation of his religious vows. He was burnt in 1557."

Andrews, and the chief towns in Scotland, forbidding all persons, under severe penalties, to commune or converse with the murderers of the late cardinal.[1] In all this, however, we must consider Knox as carrying into effect the lessons he had received from his tutor John Major, that if rulers become tyrannical, they may be controlled or deposed, and even put to death by their subjects, the latter being the sole judges as to their criminality, and as to the kind and degree of punishment which they deserve.[2]

When at St Andrews, Knox naturally attached himself to Rough, and supported him in his controversies with the Romish clergy.[3] "At last," says Skinner, in his Ecclesiastical History, "a congregation being formed in the town, partly of the town's people, and partly from the castle, a thought struck them of having Mr Knox for their preacher; and, to go about it with some show of regularity, they gave him a kind of *call*, by the mouth of Mr Rough their former volunteer, which, upon their principle, seems to have been altogether superfluous; as Mr Knox's right to preach without any call, was just as good as Mr Rough's had been before. But whatever right either of them had, so it was, in fact, that Mr Knox now looked upon himself as a lawful minister of St Andrews;[4] in which

[1] Appendix to the Epistolæ Regum, p. 344.

[2] P. 282. Also M'Cries' Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 8. See the same sentiments avowed by Knox himself throughout his History of the Reformation.

[3] Both the Reformers were in the pay of England, Knox receiving £40, and Rough £20 per annum. "Knox," says Chalmers, "was also corrupted by England, as the books of Privy Council evince." Life of Sir D. Lindsay, p. 32.

[4] Dr M'Crie thinks that the call by Rough and the conspirators in the castle was valid and sufficient, and that Knox himself was of this opinion. (Life of Knox, i. 57.) In the same place, he alludes to the doctrine of the apostolical succession, which he laments "has been revived in the present enlightened age, and unblushingly avowed and defended." It is an easy way of condemning a doctrine, to give it

character, upon the Sunday after his instalment, he preached his first public sermon in the parish kirk, from Dan. viii. 24, applying his explanation of this mystical passage to the Church of Rome, which he described as Anti-Christ, or the man of sin, and drawing his conclusions accordingly." This sermon brought on a dispute between a friar who was present, of the name of Arbuthnot, which was carried to such a height, that Wynram the sub-prior was obliged to interfere and separate the disputants. After this, Wynram held a clerical conference in St Leonards' college, consisting of Knox, Rough, and some Grey and Black friars, ("black *fiends*," Knox calls them in his History,) where they had a long controversy on the disputed points, which, though it produced no effect upon the leading disputants, added to the popularity and the number of the reformers in the city. But in order to prevent farther defection from the Church, the clergy of the university and of the monasteries resolved to preach themselves in the parish church on Sundays, by which means Knox was obliged to confine himself to the week days. This he continued to do for several months, none venturing to molest him, through fear of his parishioners in the castle. During this time he once administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to those who were willing to receive it from his hands.[1]

hard names, which men are apt to do exactly in proportion as they feel their inability to refute it. At any rate, a call to the ministry by means of the apostolical succession, is preferable to a call by a preaching friar, seconded by a band of assassins.

[1] An engraving has lately been published representing the Reformer in the act of performing this ceremony, which is said, in the title, to have taken place in the castle, though it more probably occurred in the parish church. But however this might be, several of the men who were the actual murderers of Cardinal Beaton and his faithful porter, and many more who were accessaries to these murders, are among those to whom the holy communion is being administered! Both Knox himself and Lindsay of Pitscottie give so bad a character

Here let us remark in passing, that when we take into account the lax notions entertained by our leading Reformers, as to what constituted a valid title to preach the gospel and administer the sacraments, together with their ignorance or disregard of antiquity on this vital question, we need not greatly wonder at the irregularity of the above-mentioned proceedings, which were in entire accordance with other things which, we shall see, they did afterwards. John Knox, in his First Book of Discipline, went so far as to abolish the form of ordination altogether, as a useless ceremony: nor was it resumed by his successors till several years after his death. His words are, "Ordinary vocation consisteth in election, examination, and admission. Other ceremonies than the public approbation of the people, and declaration of the chief minister, [who is the chief minister?] that the person there preferred is appointed to serve the church, we cannot approve; for albeit the apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge not necessary." I shall not stop to point out the astonishing misconception of the constitution and perpetuity of the Christian Church which these words denote; but proceed to observe, that, when the Reformers first declared that the Liturgy of Edward VI. should be used in Scotland, it was to be read, they said, by "the best *qualified* in the parish;" and again, that at the public meetings, "it shall be lawful for any *qualified* person to interpret Scripture." This notion, of the priestly functions being performed by any one who, in his own opinion, or that of others, might be qualified for the work, was virtually abolishing the order of the priesthood; and

of those men, that it is surprising a modern painter should have chosen so revolting a subject for a picture. *Ladies* too are introduced among them, who should have been the last persons to be seen in such company.

paved the way for the confusion, irregularity, and perpetual change which afterwards prevailed in Scotland, and indeed still prevails, on this most important subject.

Meanwhile, the English and French governments were both active in their preparations: the former to succour the garrison in the castle, the latter to attack them. But the French were ready first. In the summer of 1547, they sent twenty-one galleys, under the command of Leon Stronzius prior of Capua, both a priest and a warrior, to assist the Governor of Scotland in reducing the castle. "When the news came," says Lindsay, "that these vessels were seen off St Abb's head, steering for St Andrews, the governor, well content hereof, hasted him to St Andrews, with the gentlemen of Fife, Angus, and Strathearn, and welcomed the French captain, prior of Capua, directed from the French king to besiege the castle, and to bring the keepers of it prisoners to him. They clapt about the house so hastily and unexpectedly, that many were closed out, and divers were closed in, against their will. They *mounted their ordnance both upon the college steeple, and also upon the walls*" (probably the roof,) "*of the abbey kirk*, wherewith they condemned the castle close; so that no man durst walk therein, or go up to the wall head. The captain told the governor that they had been unexpert warriors who had not mounted their ordnance on the steeple heads in that manner, and that he wondered at the keepers of the castle, that they had not first broken down the heads of the steeples. He caused also the great battery to be laid to the castle, the two Scottish cannon and six French; and, to *prevent* [prevent] slaughter, he devised that the cannon should pass down the streets by engines, without any man with them; which thing when the Italian engineer

(which had been sent from England for the support of those within the castle) perceived, he said, that they had now to do with men of war, and therefore had need to take heed to themselves. They answered that they should defend their castle against Scotland, France, and Ireland, all three. But the battery within a few hours made such breaches in the wall that, despairing of their strength, after consultation, they yielded the castle and themselves to the King of France. The French captain entered and spoiled the castle very rigorously; wherein they found great store of vivers, clothes, armour, silver, and plate, which, with the captives, they carried away in their galleys. The governor, by the advice of the council, demolished the castle, lest it should be a receptacle of rebels. This befell in the year one thousand five hundred and forty-seven, in the month of August." To the same effect the "Diurnal of Occurrents" says, "they tuke the auld and young Lairds of Grange, Normound Leslie, the Laird of Pitmillie, Mr Henry Balnevis, and John Knox, with mony utheris, to the nomber of sex score persones, and caryit thame all away to France; and tuke the spoilzie of the said castell, quhilk was worth 100,000 pundis, and tuke doun the hous."

Knox was carried by the French to their own country, and obliged to serve on board their galleys; where we must leave him for the present, to follow out the episcopate of Archbishop Hamilton, which had thus inauspiciously commenced.

In 1548, the English army, having defeated the Scots in the battle of Pinkie, spread themselves over a great part of the south-eastern counties of Scotland; and, among other places, they took possession of Broughty castle at the estuary of the Tay, and fortified it. From this stronghold they made numerous predatory excursions. On one occasion they landed

at Port-on-craig in Fife, and proceeded to burn Leuchars, and other adjacent villages or farm-steadings; but the Prior of St Andrews, Lords Rothes and Lindsay, Sir A. Wood of Largo, and other Fife gentlemen, being made aware of their hostile attempts, got between them and their boats; and having attacked them with great vigour, killed eighty of their best men, and took most of the others prisoners. Pitscottie, who tells the story, adds, "but frae that tyme forth they desired not to land in Fife." Most of these Fife gentlemen were friendly to the English and the Reformation; but they were not willing, on that account, to see their lands wasted and their tenants plundered.

While these things were being transacted, Archbishop Hamilton was engaged in completing St Mary's college, which his two predecessors, Archbishops James and David Beaton, had commenced. Having finished the college, he endowed it out of his archiepiscopal revenues, in virtue of a bull of Pope Julius III., dated 1552, with lands and tithes for the maintenance of four principal professors, called the provost, licentiate, bachelor, and canonist; eight students of theology; three professors of philosophy, and two of rhetoric and grammar; five vicars-pensionary, sixteen students of philosophy, a provisor, cook, and janitor. But it is a striking instance of the mutability of human affairs and of human opinions, that in seven short years from the time of which we are now speaking, a great part of this endowment was swept away by the Reformation, and the rest of it converted to totally opposite purposes to what their founders contemplated. The college now consists of only four professors of divinity, a janitor, and a few bursars! And even their incomes are drawn in part from other sources than their original endowments. The college

was endowed purposely, (as the foundation-charter expresses it) "for defending and confirming the Catholic faith, that the Christian religion might flourish, the word of God be more abundantly sown in the hearts of the faithful, and to oppose the heresies and schisms of the pestiferous heresiarchs who, alas! have sprung up and flourished in these times, in this as well as in other parts of the world." Yet the greater part of the professors and students belonging to St Mary's college, changed with the times, and joined the reformers! What must have been the reflections of Hamilton, during the eleven years which he survived the Reformation, to witness the appropriation of his college revenues to the very purposes he was most anxious to prevent! The professors of St Leonard's college followed the example of St Mary's; but it was different with St Salvator's. The principal, William Cranston, and most of the regents adhered to the ancient faith, and quitted their places.

In 1549 the archbishop held a provincial council at Linlithgow, which was afterwards adjourned to Edinburgh. At it were present six bishops, two vicars-general, ten abbots or priors, three commendators, (one of whom was Lord James Stuart, afterward the Regent Moray,) twenty-seven friars of different orders, besides professors, (among whom was John Major,) doctors, and licentiates in theology. The council set forth, as the prime causes of heresy, *first*, the corruption and profane lewdness of the clergy of *almost* every degree, (omnium *fere* graduum;) and *secondly*, their ignorance of all arts and sciences. Their worst enemies never charged them with more than what they now willingly admitted. For correcting these abuses, no fewer than fifty-seven new canons were enacted. In general, they were well adapted for establishing good order, and promoting learning and morality among the clergy.

Had they been introduced some years earlier, and acted upon impartially, they might have checked the progress of the Reformation; but they came too late.[1]

Another ecclesiastical council was held by the primate at Edinburgh, in 1551. Whatever might be the defects in Hamilton's character, he cannot be charged with remissness in assembling councils. At this meeting, two things were determined which it will be necessary for us to notice. The first of them was regarding a dispute which had arisen among the clergy and professors of the university, the absurd nature of which might justify us in passing it over, did it not afford a curious picture of the opinions of the times. The question was, whether the Lord's Prayer ought to be addressed immediately to God, or to the saints in conjunction with him! The divines of the ecclesiastical metropolis could not, it seems, settle this difficult point; and hence they were obliged to refer it to the wisdom and learning of a provincial council. By that body it was finally, but not very intelligibly, settled, that the Paternoster should be addressed to God, but in such a manner that the saints should not be excluded! and Wynram the sub-prior of the monastery was enjoined to announce this decision to the university.

The other matter agreed upon at this council was the publication of a catechism, the purport of which will be gathered from its title: "The Catechisme, that is to say, Ane comone and Catholik instruction of the Christine people, in materis of our Catholik faith and religion quhilk na gud Christine man or woman suld misknaw; set forth by ye maist reverend Father in God, Johne archbischop of Sanct Androis, legat nait, and primat of ye kirk of Scotland, in his provin-

[1] Dalrymple's Scottish Provincial Councils, p. 30.

cial counsale halden at Edinburgh, the xvi. day of Januaire, the zeir of our Lord 1551, with the advise and counsale of the bischoppis and uther prelatis, with doctours of theologie and canon law of ye said realme of Scotland, present for the tyme."—"Prentit at Sanct Androis, be the commaund and expens of the maist reverend Father in God, Johne archbischop of Sanct Androis, and primat of the hail kirk of Scotland, the xix. day of August, in the zeir of our Lord MDLII." This work is a small quarto volume in black letter, and consists of an able, and, upon the whole, temperate exposition of the Roman Catholic tenets. An original copy is preserved in the university library, St Andrews. It was ordered to be read by the parish priests to the people on Sundays and holidays, but not to be put into the hands of the laity without the permission of the Ordinary. The motto is from St Augustine, "Contra rationem nemo sobrius, contra scripturam nemo christianus, contra ecclesiam nemo pacificus senserit." The subjects treated are, the Ten Commandments—the articles of the Creed—the Seven Sacraments—the Paternoster—the Ave Maria—Prayers to the Saints—and Prayers for the Dead. The book contains much pious and excellent advice; nor is there a great deal in it that an orthodox Christian would object to. The primate and his council no doubt hoped that it would check the progress of the new opinions; but they had obtained too wide a circulation, and sunk too deep into the minds of the Scottish people, to be arrested by so feeble a barrier as this.

While I am on the subject of printing at St Andrews, I may remark that all that this city can now boast of, is a small press for throwing off hand-bills! But besides Archbishop Hamilton's catechism, the city has the honour of having produced "The Com-

playnt of Scotland" in 1548, one of the first books in prose printed in this country, the author of which is said to have been a Sir James Inglis. In 1554, Sir David Lindsay printed a volume entitled "Ane dialog of the miserabill estaite of this warld," which, though it bears the date of Copenhagen, is proved to have issued from the press of St Andrews. There were also printed here, in 1559, by the same author, the "Dream," "The Complaynt of the King's Papingo," and "The Tragedie of Cardinal Beaton;" copies of which are said to be still preserved in the Lambeth Library. All these last-mentioned works contain sentiments hostile to Popery. The truth is, that though some of the enemies of the papal church were made examples of, by far the greater part escaped unmolested. Whether this proceeded from inability, or unwillingness to prosecute, may perhaps be made a question.

About the year 1552, an event occurred in the personal history of the primate, which may be thought deserving of notice. He had fallen into a dangerous and painful asthma; and, unable to obtain relief from the Scottish, German, or French physicians, he sent to Milan for the celebrated Cardan, a man who united in his profession the pretensions of the astrologer with the skill of the physician. This person remained with the primate eleven weeks, at his country residence of Monimail,[1] and gave him such directions as, within two years, restored him to his former health; but it was generally believed that he owed more to the magical power than to the medical skill of the Italian. The latter is said to have given him a forcible proof of his astrological foreknowledge by assuring him that he would one day be hanged! but,

[1] A well, called "Cardan's well," is still to be seen at Monimail.

like most stories of the kind, the prophecy does not seem to have been divulged till the event had confirmed it. At any rate, Cardan was not always a true prophet; for, when he visited the court of Edward VI., on his return to Italy, he calculated the nativity of that prince, and promised him a long life, though he died the next year. Randolph, who was ambassador in Scotland from the English court, in a letter to Cecil, tells him jestingly of Cardan's "hanging up the archbishop *by the heels*, and feeding him with *young whelps*; and also that he had accommodated him with the use of a *devil* for nine years, neither more nor less." This ridiculous story may at least serve to show the current opinion then entertained of Cardan's pretensions, or of Hamilton's credulity. It also proves that the English ambassador was not unwilling to propagate anecdotes to the archbishop's discredit.

But Cardan himself, who is a voluminous writer, has left us some account of his visit to, and cure of, the primate, which, as it is curious, I will here translate:—"The most illustrious John *Aumulthon*, archbishop of St Andrews, had been oppressed for ten years with a difficulty of breathing, which would occasionally attack him with extreme severity for many days at a time. When his own physicians had tried everything without effect, he consulted those of the King of France and of Charles V. with no better success. He was then advised to send for me, which he did, remitting 200 crowns for my journey. His wish was, that I should meet him at Lyons, where I was to receive 300 crowns more; but if he could not conveniently come as far as that city, that I should proceed to Paris, where he would be sure to meet me. I therefore consented, and, confident in my skill, repaired to Lyons, but found no one there. After

waiting forty-six days, the archbishop's own physician, William Casanatus, arrived, and begged that I would go on, not only to Paris, but all the way to Scotland. At first I refused, but at length, overcome by his entreaties, I went with him. When I arrived, I found the physician of the Medical Institute of Paris attempting, but in vain, to cure the archbishop. I pointed out to this gentleman the cause of his failure: this made the archbishop angry with him, and that made *him* angry with *me;* and this anger increased, the more my efforts succeeded: so that, after seventy-five days, finding my situation disagreeable, I asked, and with difficulty obtained, permission to return home; but not without leaving such directions with the patient as completely cured him within two years from that time. When he was satisfied that he was in a fair way of recovery, he sent to me Michael his chief chamberlain, who proposed to deduct from my fee what was due to the French physician, but to this I would by no means consent. The archbishop's illness cost him 1800 gold crowns; of which 1400 fell to my share."[1]

While Hamilton was suffering from the effects of this disorder which was thought to be incurable, the pope appointed Gavin Hamilton abbot of Kilwinning, to be his coadjutor and successor in the see; but that appointment was cancelled after his recovery.

Meantime, the reformers, who had assumed the title of "The Congregation of Christ," (most of whom shared largely in the plunder of the church after the Reformation,) were carrying things with a high hand, declaring themselves to be the only true Church of God, and denouncing their opponents as "the anti-christian members of Satan," "the pestilent prelates

[1] Vol. i. pp. 32, 109.

after that he had been in Almaine, and had heard the doctrine of the Gospel, returned again into Scotland, and, setting aside all papistry and compelled chastity, married a wife, which thing made him, unto the bishops of Scotland, to be suspected of heresy; and, after long watching of him, he was taken by two popish priests, one called Sir George Strachan, and the other Sir Hugh Curry, servants to the said bishop for the time, within the town of Dysart in Fife, and brought to St Andrews, and imprisoned in the castle thereof. He being in prison, the papists earnestly travelled and laboured to have seduced him, and threatened him with death, and corporal torments, to the intent they might cause him to recant and forsake the truth. But seeing they could profit nothing thereby, and that he remained still firm and constant, they laboured to persuade him by fair promises, and offered unto him a monk's portion for all the days of his life in the abbey of Dunfermline, so that he would deny the things he had taught, and grant that they were heresy; but he, continuing in the truth, even unto the end, despised their threatenings and fair promises.

"Then assembled together the Bishops of St Andrews, Moray, Brechin, Caithness, and Athens, the Abbots of Dunfermline, Lindores, Balindrinot, [Balmerino?] and Cupar, with doctors of theology of St Andrews, as John Cresson black-friar, and Dean John Wynram sub-prior of St Andrews, William Cranstoun provost of the old college, with divers others, as sundry friars, Black and Grey: these being assembled, and having consulted together, he was taken out of prison, and brought to the metropolitan church, where he was put in a pulpit before the bishops, to be accused, the 20th day of April. Being brought into the church, and climbing up into the pulpit, they,

seeing him so feeble and weak of person, partly by age and travel and partly by evil intreatment, that without help he could not climb up, they were out of hope to have heard him for weakness of voice; but when he began to speak, he made the church to ring and sound again, with so great courage and stoutness, that the Christians which were present were no less rejoiced than the adversaries were confounded and ashamed. He being in the pulpit, and on his knees at prayer, Sir Andrew Oliphant, one of the bishop's priests, commanded him to arise, and to answer to his articles, saying on this manner, 'Sir Walter Mille, arise, and answer to the articles, for you hold my lord here over long.' To whom Walter, after he had finished his prayer, answered, saying, 'We ought to obey God rather than men; I serve one more mighty, even the omnipotent Lord; and when ye call me Sir Walter, call me Walter, and not Sir Walter; I have been over long one of the pope's knights. Now say what thou hast to say.'"—[Here follows the examination, which I omit because of its length, and its resemblance to similar examinations.]

"These things rehearsed they of purpose, with other light trifles to augment their final accusation, and then Sir Andrew Oliphant pronounced sentence against him; that he should be delivered to the temporal judge, and punished as a heretic, which was, to be burnt. Notwithstanding, his boldness and constancy moved so the hearts of many, that the bishop's steward of his regality, provost of the town, called Patrick Learmond, refused to be his temporal judge, to whom it appertained if the cause had been just. Also the bishop's chamberlain, being therewith charged, would in nowise take upon him so ungodly an office. Yea, the whole town was so offended with his unjust condemnation, that the bishop's servants could not

get for their money so much as one cord to tie him to the stake, or a tar-barrel to burn him, but were constrained to cut the cords of their master's own pavilion to serve their turn.

"Nevertheless, one servant of the bishop's, more ignorant and cruel than the rest, called Alexander Simmerwaill, enterprising the office of a temporal judge in that part, conveyed him to the fire, where, against all natural reason of man, his boldness and hardiness did more and more increase, so that the Spirit of God, working miraculously in him, made it manifest to the people that his cause and articles were most just, and he innocently put down.

"Now, when all things were ready for his death, and he conveyed with armed men to the fire, Oliphant bade him pass to the stake; and he said, 'Nay, but if thou wilt put me up with thy hand, and take part of my death, thou shalt see me pass up gladly; for by the law of God I am forbidden to put hands upon myself.' Then Oliphant put him up with his hand, and he ascended gladly, saying, 'Introibo ad altare Dei,' and desired that he might have space to speak to the people; the which Oliphant and other of the burners denied, saying, that he had spoken over much, for the bishops were altogether offended that the matter was so long continued. Then some of the young men committed both the burners and the bishops their masters to the devil, saying that they believed they should lament that day; and desired the said Walter to speak what he pleased.

"And so after he had made his humble supplication to God on his knees, he arose, and, standing upon the coals, said on this wise: 'Dear friends, the cause why I suffer this day is not for any crime laid to my charge, (albeit I be a miserable sinner before God,) but only for the defence of the faith of Jesus Christ,

set forth in the New and Old Testament unto us, for which, as the faithful martyrs have offered themselves gladly before, being assured, after the death of their bodies, of eternal felicity, so this day I praise God that he hath called me of his mercy among the rest of his servants, to seal up his truth with my life, which, as I have received it from him, so willingly I offer it to his glory. Therefore, as you will escape the eternal death, be no more seduced with the lies of priests, monks, friars, priors, abbots, bishops, and the rest of the sect of antichrist, but depend only upon Jesus Christ and his mercy, that ye may be delivered from condemnation.' All that while, there was great mourning and lamentation of the multitude, for they, perceiving his patience, stoutness, and boldness, constancy and hardiness, were not only moved and stirred up, but their hearts also were so inflamed, that he was the last martyr that died in Scotland for the religion. After his prayers, he was hoised up on the stake; and, being in the fire, he said, 'Lord have mercy upon me; pray, people, while there is time;' and so he constantly departed.

"After this, by the just judgment of God, in the same place where Walter Mille was burnt, the images of the great church of the abbey, which passed both in number and costliness, were burnt in time of Reformation."

The place here alluded to, was in front of the main gate of the priory, or what is now called the *Pends*. The inhabitants of the city, to testify their respect for the martyr's memory, heaped up a pile of stones on the spot, which, when they were removed by the priests, were as often replaced by the people. Mill was the last person in Scotland who was burnt on a charge of Protestantism, though unhappily not the last who experienced the same painful death. (and that

too, in St Andrews), on a charge of a different kind, and inflicted by a different class of persecutors, as we shall see in the sequel of this history.

In 1558–9, Archbishop Hamilton held another provincial council in Edinburgh, with a view, if possible, to accommodate matters with the reformers, and to remove what he himself admitted to be their just grounds of objection. But it was found, in the end, that an arrangement between two such heterogeneous bodies was utterly impracticable. The reformers by this time felt their own strength, and demanded much more than they had even imagined at first. A few years before, their sole object was to purify the Church; but now they determined, the lay part of them at least, to sweep it out of existence, to apply its ample revenues to their own purposes, and to substitute a new and less wealthy establishment in its place. The Romanists, on the other hand, would yield no point of consequence; and declared, that as the Council of Trent, which was then sitting, was a general council convened by the Head of the Church, they regarded its decrees as infallible, and were resolved to adhere to them. The crisis of the Reformation was now rapidly approaching to its height.

We left John Knox on board the French galleys in 1547, where he was kept nearly three years. After being liberated, he went to England, and officiated as a minister of the Anglican Church at Berwick and Newcastle. This fact, together with the circumstance of his bringing up two of his sons as ministers of the same church, are proofs that our reformer had no very serious objection to its constitution and ceremonies, though unhappily he neglected to form that of Scotland after its model. But his opinions as to the constitution of the Christian Church, were never of a very decided character, and easily yielded to circumstances.

When Queen Mary ascended the English throne, he retired to Geneva, where he became acquainted with, and adopted the sentiments of Calvin. From Geneva he proceeded to Frankfort. There he embroiled himself in a dispute with the English refugees, regarding the liturgy of Edward VI., to many parts of which he objected, but which were strenuously defended by Dr Cox, who had been before this Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and was afterwards Bishop of Ely. Knox, finding his opponent more than a match for him, soon left Frankfort and returned to Geneva. In 1555, we find him in Scotland; the following year at Geneva again; and lastly, in his native country in the month of May of the memorable year 1559.

In consequence of a sermon which he preached at Perth, the multitude rose *en masse*, and destroyed the Carthusian, Franciscan, and Dominican monasteries in that town. In his "History of the Reformation," he condemns this act as a wanton outrage committed by "the rascal multitude;" but he had roused their passions by his inflammatory sermon, and could not, therefore, be irresponsible for their excesses. He next travelled along the south coast of Fife, and preached at Anstruther and Crail, where his progress was still marked by the destruction of the religious buildings. On the 9th day of June, he reached St Andrews, accompanied by Erskine of Dun, Wishart of Pitarrow, and Provost Halyburton of Dundee, as well as by a "rascal multitude" from Crail, who had just manifested their zeal in the cause of Reformation by the demolition of their own collegiate church,[1] and were eager for an opportunity of acting over again

[1] The silver vessels used in the service of this church, weighed 323 ounces, "Fragmenta Scoto-Monastica," pp. xxxv. xxxviii. The gold and silver in some of the churches must have been immense, which its alleged idolatrous use did not hinder the reformers from plundering. "All this tyme," says the Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 269, "all

the same part in the ecclesiastical metropolis. In all this, it deserves notice, that they were not only perpetrating acts of wanton sacrilege, but contravening an express act of the legislature which had been issued in June 1546, forbidding, under severe penalties, the very outrages they were now deliberately committing.[1]

At St Andrews, Knox met by appointment with the Prior of the Augustinian monastery, the well-known Lord James Stewart, and with Archibald the fifth Earl of Argyll. But I must pause here a moment to make a few remarks on these the two most influential of the lay Reformers of Scotland, the first of whom was, at this time, only twenty-six years old, and the latter no more than eighteen; both, it must be confessed, far too young and inexperienced, and as the event proved, too greedy of "filthy lucre," to conduct so momentous a work as the Reformation of the Christian Church.

The father of the young earl had taken an oath, a few years before this, to be faithful to Archbishop Hamilton, and to defend him from his enemies, in consideration of the renewal of the lease of certain lands which he held of him, the above prior being the chief witness to the document.[2] The old earl dying the following year, "left in his testament," says Knox in his History, "that his son should study to set forward the public and true preaching of the evangel of Jesus Christ, and suppress all superstition and idolatry to the utmost of his power; in which, small fault can be found with him to this day, 10th May, 1568. God

kirkmennis goodis and gear, were spulyeit and reft fra thame, in every place quhair the samyn culd be apprehendit; for every man, for the maist pairt, that culd get any thing pertenying to any kirkmen, thocht the same as weel won gear."

[1] Appendix to the Epistolæ Regum Scotiæ, p. 315.

[2] Martine's Reliquiæ, p. 143.

be merciful to his other (?) offences." These offences were, I presume, *first*, regarding his wife, Lady Jane Stewart, from whom he was separated on account of some scandal; *secondly*, his well-known adherence to the cause of Queen Mary, from the day of her arrival in Scotland, down to the fatal battle of Langside, which, no doubt, in the eyes of Knox, was his greatest offence of all; but, *thirdly*, his greatest *real* offence, was the appropriation of the revenues of no less than three bishopries to his own use! He managed the matter thus: he persuaded Queen Mary, over whom he had great influence, to appoint a *boy* of the name of Campbell to the bishopric of Brechin, through whom he drew its rents; and he made one of the *reformed ministers*, Carswell, titular Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, and through him, in like manner, he drew the rents of these two bishopries.[1]

In regard to the Prior of St Andrews, he is canonized among the "Scots Worthies," and styled, by a modern historian,[2] a "great and good man;" on which I shall merely remark, that if the violation of his monastic vows, which he had engaged to observe "sub anathematis pœna et maledictionis æternæ;" the infringement of the rules of St Leonard's college, which, as prior, he had sworn to uphold; the appropriation of an immense amount of church property to his own and his family's use; and rebellion against his queen and sister,—if these could entitle him to this eulogium, no one ever deserved it more. In 1557, he acted with the queen-dowager; received money from the French king for his promised services; and stipulated for the presence of a French army in Scotland.[3] Yet, within

[1] Keith's Catalogue, *in loco*. Argyll was twice married, yet died without male issue; and we know what was the fate of Mary, who was a party to this abominable sacrilege.

[2] Dr M'Cric.

[3] Tytler, vol. vi. p. 448.

two years, he turned, and along with the other Lords of the Congregation, sold himself to Queen Elizabeth.[1] Queen Mary, in this very year, (1559,) hearing of his rebellious conduct, wrote to him the following letter, which must have touched him to the quick, if he had possessed the feelings of a good Christian, an affectionate brother, or a faithful subject: "I cannot, cousin, but greatly wonder that you, who are not only nearest to us by blood, but also, as you know, greatly benefited by us in many ways, should be so bold or malicious, as, by one and the same deed, to overthrow the majesty of God, and violate my authority and that of my husband. For it is astonishing to think how you who, when here, opened to me the names of the Duke of Chatelherault, and many others, who seemed to you to diminish my authority, should now, when absent, be a leader of the seditious, and hurt my dignity, even in matters of the greatest weight, wherein the honour of God is lessened, and my authority subverted; all which I should have believed more easily of any other of my subjects than of you. Truly, most grievously have I borne this, that you have falsified the confidence I had in your fidelity; though, even now, I can scarce be persuaded that you are so far from truth and reason as to be carried away by such blind errors; and I pray that God may give you light, that, returning into the right way, you may yet show yourself a good man, and obedient to our laws, by undoing the evil you have done. Wherefore, by these letters, I earnestly admonish and desire you to atone for your past misconduct by your future good behaviour, that so the anger which I, and the king my husband, have conceived against you, may be pacified. Otherwise I would have you understand that we will execute such

[1] Tytler, vol. vi. p. 160.

punishment on you as will be to you most grievous. I pray God keep you from all danger.—Paris, 9 Kal. Aug. 1559."

But, by the time the prior had received the foregoing letter, he felt his own power and importance, and had his own selfish objects in view, from which he was not to be deterred by such feminine remonstrances as these. He afterwards, it is well known, became reconciled to Mary, and experienced her generosity and forgiving disposition in many ways; yet, in the end, he took up arms against her, imprisoned her in Lochleven castle, and forced her to appoint himself regent of her kingdom. And when she escaped from prison, he again raised an army against her; drove her into England; accused her to Queen Elizabeth of having murdered her husband; and, in short, was the chief cause of those calamities which embittered her life, and brought her to a tragical death. Admitting his right and qualifications to be a reformer, instead of wantonly plundering and destroying his church,[1] his object should have been to purify and perpetuate it, which he and his coadjutors might

[1] In the Advocates' Library is a very thick folio volume, entitled "Liber Sancti Andreæ et Pittenweem." The first part contains copies of charters, leases, infeftments, &c., of the various properties which had belonged to the Priory of St Andrews, granted by Moray and those of the convent who joined with him. The first date is 1553, and the last 1566; for so many years was this "abhorrer of idols and committer of sacrilege," occupied in robbing his own church! The second part of the volume contains charters and infeftments by the same "Christian statesman," (as his admirers call him,) of the lands belonging to the Priory of Pittenweem, of which he was commendator. His being a *pluralist*, under the old system, afforded him the greater facilities for being a *plunderer* under the new. Many of these documents begin, *In nomine Dei, amen!* At the end of the same volume, are some similar charters granted by Robert Stewart, who succeeded to so much of the priory lands and tithes as a "Good Regent" was pleased to leave undisposed of. It would be curious to trace the disposal of these numerous properties, the equivalents received for them, and the various hands through which they have subsequently passed.

easily have done had they been so disposed, and which would surely have been a wiser and safer course than to plunge headlong into sacrilege, perjury, and treason. He might, at least, have had some reverence for the primate, his immediate ecclesiastical superior; for his own metropolitan cathedral; and still more for his ancient monastery, of which he was the last, and the least worthy, of a long line of distinguished priors. He, too, like his friend Argyll, left no male issue, besides meeting with a violent death.

Such was the character and behaviour of the two most influential of the *lay* reformers of Scotland.[1] I shall only add, as to both of them, that it has recently been proved they were afterwards concerned in the conspiracy to murder Rizzio; that Argyll was a party to the murder of Darnley;[2] and that, if Moray were not,[3] he was, at any rate, so unprincipled as to

[1] The Rev. Mr Scott, senior minister of Perth in 1810, published a "History of the Lives of the Protestant Reformers in Scotland." He confines himself to the *ministers*, of whom he enumerates fifteen; his work being avowedly favourable to them. Yet, even on his own showing, they could not have been, as to rank, character, and qualifications, the men from whom a right reformation was to be expected. Only seven out of the fifteen had received holy orders in the Roman or Anglican churches. Two of these, Douglas and Carswell, allowed themselves to be made *tulchan bishops*, and simonaically made over their episcopal revenues to the lay peers who had appointed them to their office! Wynram was acknowledged to be a weak, time-serving man. Of Knox I shall say nothing at present, except that I would recommend his admirers to *prove* his "divine legation," and no longer to *assume* it. Paul Methven, who had been a baker in Dundee, committed adultery, and retired to England. Goodman, of whom we shall hear more in the next chapter, and Willock, grew tired of their work, and also retired to England. Of Harlowe, Herriot, and Chrysiston, very little is known, except that the first had been a tailor in Edinburgh, and the second a monk in St Andrews. The remaining five, Row, Erskine, Spotswood, Ferguson, and Lindsay, were respectable men, but not much, if at all, above mediocrity.

[2] Tytler's History of Scotland, vol. vii. p. 28.

[3] Whitaker's Vindication of Queen Mary, vol. iii. p. 276–289. This writer makes it very probable that Moray was concerned in Darnley's murder. He is farther of opinion, that the rebellions, the sacrilege, the private assassinations, the forgeries of public documents, and,

accept the assistance of Lord Morton, whom he knew to be one of the murderers, to implicate his sister the queen in that nefarious transaction! We may easily believe that, when men of this character met John Knox and his followers at St Andrews to help on the cause of Reformation, they were more likely to encourage than impede "the rascal multitude," in the destruction of the sacred buildings.

"Archbishop Hamilton," says Keith, "hearing that Mr Knox intended on the morrow, which was Sunday, the 11th June, 1559, to preach to the Congregation in his cathedral church of St Andrews, came thither the Saturday before, accompanied with a hundred armed men to stop him. And the Lords of the Congregation were so apprehensive of the mischief that might follow, (considering that Falkland, where the queen and the French lay, was but twelve miles distant from St Andrews,) that they counselled Mr Knox to forbear preaching at that time. But no persuasion of his friends, nor threatening of his enemies could prevail with him." Accordingly, he preached on the 11th and the three following days, a series of inflammatory discourses[1] on the subject of Christ's purifying the temple of Jerusalem: the effect of which

generally, the principle of doing evil that good might come, on the part of the Scottish reformers, were the means of checking, and finally arresting the progress of the Reformation in Christendom. Tytler thinks it "impossible to believe Moray ignorant" of the resolution to murder Darnley, vol. vii. p. 81.

[1] A fine engraving of "Knox preaching before the Lords of the Congregation at St Andrews," has lately been published from a painting by Wilkie, in which the artist has certainly caught the attitude of the Reformer as described by one who had often heard him preach, that "he was sa active and vigorous, that he was lyk to ding the pulpit in blads, and flie out of it." But, as in most historical pieces, several persons are introduced who, it is certain, were not present. The primate, who is one of them, had fled to Falkland the day before; Buchanan, who is another, was abroad; and the Admirable Crichton, who is a third, was not born till the year after.

was, that on the 15th, the mob were incited to commence pulling down almost all the sacred edifices in the city. They not only demolished, in whole or in part, the monasteries of the Black and Grey friars, the Priory, the Provostry of Kirkheugh, and the ancient church of St Regulus, but the SPLENDID CATHEDRAL—the metropolitan church of Scotland for so many centuries, the scene of so many interesting events, the tomb of so many prelates, all of them eminent for their rank or their learning, and most of them for their piety and virtue.

It might have occurred to the preacher and his audience that there was a wide difference between purifying the temple and destroying it. But the "still small voice" of reason is not heard amidst the uproar of the passions. Knox's very partial biographer[1] thus speaks of the above proceedings: "Such was the influence of his doctrine, that the provost, bailies, and inhabitants of St Andrews, *harmoniously agreed* to set up the reformed worship in the town; the church was stripped of its images and pictures, and the monasteries pulled down." He avoids all mention of the destruction of the cathedral. He even goes so far as to justify these outrages: "I look upon the destruction of these monuments as a piece of *good policy*, which contributed materially to the overthrow of the Roman Catholic religion, and the prevention of its reëstablishment!" The English, we may remark, contrived to preserve both their Reformation and their cathedrals, and why could not the Scotch? Evidently, because in Scotland the Reformation, instead of being effected by the government and the church, was brought about chiefly by the aristocracy and the populace; the former of whom thought of nothing but of

[1] Dr M'Crie, p. 138.

securing to themselves the church lands; and the latter had no other notion of reformation than of flying from one extreme to the other.

Knox gave as his reason for destroying the religious edifices, that the only way to drive away the rooks, was to pull down their nests. He did accordingly pull down the nests, and the rooks did fly away; but what kind of birds came in their place? Certainly not birds of paradise. And what kind of nests did they construct? None half so good as those they destroyed.

We have no details of the destruction of the religious buildings of St Andrews beyond what I have related; nor have I been able to ascertain, in particular, *how long* the cathedral took to be reduced to its present state,—whether it were the work of days or of years. We may, I think, conclude, that at the popular outbreak in the year 1559, much injury would be done to the building itself, as well as to its images, ornaments, and monuments; and that everything of any value would be removed. But it ought to be remembered that, the very next year, the Protestant leaders, in order to testify their approbation of such outrages, and to finish systematically what may have commenced accidentally, passed an act of their own for "demolishing cloysters and abbey churches, such as were not yet pulled down;" or, as Knox in his "History" expresses it, that "all places and monumentis of idolatrie should be destroyed." Then, in all probability, the cathedral would be reduced nearly to the state in which we now see it. It must, at least, have been so much dilapidated as to be beyond the possibility of repair; otherwise, it would most likely have been preserved as the metropolitan church after the partial restoration of episcopacy in 1572, and its full reëstablishment in 1610. The above-mentioned

order for the demolition of the remaining "monumentis of idolatrie" was entrusted to the most zealous of the reforming peers, viz., the Earls of Argyle, Arran, and Glencairn in the west and south, and the Prior of St Andrews in the north. "Whereupon," says Spotswood, "ensued a pitiful vastation of churches and church buildings, throughout all parts of the kingdom, for every one made bold to put to his hands; the meaner sort imitating the example of the greater. No difference was made; but all churches either defaced or pulled to the ground. The holy vessels and whatsoever else they could make gain of, as timber, lead, and bells, were put to sale." The very sepulchres of the dead were not spared; not even those of our kings and queens at Iona, Dunfermline, Scone, Melrose, Arbroath, and Holyrood; so that there was not one left entire in Scotland. Nor was this all. The numerous libraries and MSS. belonging to the religious houses were, for the most part, burnt. Charters were destroyed by those who had seized on the temporalities of benefices, in the hope of their being more secure in the possession of what they well knew had been bequeathed for far different purposes; and thus a large proportion of the bulls of popes, charters of kings, noblemen, and prelates; acts of national and diocesan councils, ancient histories, registers, and chronicles, were swept away in one general destruction. A certain number of these, indeed, were saved, and carried over to France, where they were deposited in the Scots college at Paris. Unfortunately, however, many of them experienced the same fate from the French Jacobins in 1790 which the first had experienced from the Scotch fanatics in 1560,—so apt are extremes to meet, and the same atrocities to be committed by men holding diametrically opposite principles! Whatever might

be the errors of Popery, nothing could justify the lawless proceedings by which it was suppressed in this country. We are not to do evil that good may come. Collier, the ecclesiastical historian, makes the following just reflections on the conduct of our Scottish reformers:—"To see noble structures, consecrated to the honour of the ever blessed Trinity, where all the articles of the Apostles' Creed were professed, the Christian sacraments administered, and all the inspired writings received as such; places where there was no polytheism in addressing devils, no roasting of children; no licentious worship so much as pretended; in short, where there was no resemblance of a parallel with the heathen idolatry mentioned in the Old and New Testaments,—I say, to see the houses of God thus ravaged and razed, the holy furniture made plunder, and the church estates seized, gives a frightful idea of some of these reformers. And to consider the fact, without knowing the whole history, would almost make a man believe some rough, unconverted nation had made an invasion and carried the country. 'Tis true these extraordinary proceedings had something of the face of authority; but when the matter is a little examined, the reader will find there is nothing but colour and varnish in this appearance; for these undertakers in religion had neither the concurrence of the spiritual estate nor any commission from the crown. They could not so much as presume upon their queen's consent. They well knew such methods must be highly affrontive to her majesty; so that, upon the whole, this part of their reformation was a plain violation of the constitution."

In the autumn of 1559, the city of St Andrews was as much in danger from the French Romanist party as it had been a few years before from the English Protestants. A French army, consisting of

four thousand men, under the command of General D'Oysel, marched from Stirling into Fife, for the purpose of plundering and burning the towns and villages on their route, and more especially St Andrews, which, as we have seen, had recently signalized itself by the destruction of its religious houses, and its opposition to the established faith. But a few Fife gentlemen, with five or six hundred men, headed by Kirkcaldy of Grange, an experienced officer, kept them in check; and a fleet of English men-of-war entering the Forth at the same time, and capturing one of their transports in sight of their army, induced the Frenchmen to retrace their steps, and with all speed to find their way to their head-quarters at Leith.

In 1560, the primate and his brother bishops attended the parliament in Edinburgh; which decreed, by an overwhelming majority, though without any royal sanction, the overthrow of the Roman Catholic religion in Scotland,—enacting, among other things, that all who should in future celebrate mass, or be present at its celebration, should, for the first offence, be punished by confiscation of goods; for the second, by banishment; and for the third, by *death!* "How are the times changed," remarks Mr Skinner on this enactment, "and what ugly alterations does power and prosperity make upon people's tempers! It is not above twelve months since these very men humbly petitioned for liberty of conscience, and seemed willing to rest satisfied with being allowed to worship God quietly in their own way. And yet, no sooner are their circumstances changed, and themselves set in something like a throne of judgment, but the corruption of human nature appears, the flames of an intemperate zeal break forth, and they boldly express and demand all that security and rigour of which they had so very lately, and with so much justice,

complained." The same parliament also published, under the sanction of Knox and his coadjutors, a "Confession of Faith," which continued to be the national standard for eighty years, till it was superseded by the Westminster one, which, being of a less primitive character, was, on that account, better suited to the sectarian or all-denomination taste which prevailed during the time of the grand rebellion,—as if the constitution of the Church of Christ, and the doctrines of his gospel, which are immutable, must be modified to suit the taste of fallible men, according to the circumstances in which they are placed, and the opinions which happen to prevail in different ages!

I will conclude this chapter on the Reformation, or rather on the overthrow of the Papal system in Scotland, with a few observations. *First*, Nothing could be more indefensible than the opposition to lawful authority shown by the leading reformers; an opposition which, it is well known, they carried so far as formally to depose the queen-regent from her throne, because she did not favour their views. In all cases of this kind, the line of duty is clearly laid down in Scripture, which is this,—to obey all lawful commands, and to suffer patiently for disobeying unlawful commands. I know this is not a palatable doctrine, and that people in general would much rather fight for their religion than suffer for it; and yet, there is much more true courage in suffering calmly than in fighting boldly,—and, what is more, the former means will, in all ordinary cases, succeed better in attaining the desired end than the latter. But however this may be, Scripture forbids a forcible resistance to constituted authority under any circumstances. Daniel, when forbidden to pray to his God, did not obey, because, the prohibition being sinful, obedience would have been sinful. But neither, on the

other hand, did he vituperate or threaten his enemies. He did not raise a clamour or an agitation through the empire. He did not use the influence which his high office gave him, to counteract the king's decree. He did not stir up against the government, his countrymen the Jews who were numerous in Babylon. Finally, he did not even attempt to reform the political and religious state of the community, because he had no commission for so doing. But he retired to his house, and "his windows being open towards Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a-day, and prayed and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." How differently our reformers behaved under like circumstances, I need not say. *Secondly*, It was impossible that any change, so sudden, so violent, and so lawless as the Reformation in Scotland, could be permanent; and, accordingly, we shall find that endless religious changes followed close upon it, changes that have not yet subsided. *Thirdly*, I shall quote what Bishop Hall says concerning our Reformation:—"Can you choose but observe the blessing of a monarchical reformation among us, beyond that popular and tumultuary reformation among our neighbours? Ours a council, theirs an uproar: ours beginning from the head, theirs from the feet; ours proceeding in due order, theirs with confusion; ours countenancing and encouraging the converted governors of the Church, theirs extremely overawed with adverse power, or totally overborne with foul sacriiege."[1] My concluding remark shall relate to a matter of fact; namely,—though a few of the Roman Catholic bishops joined the Reformation, in order to secure their church revenues, or to serve their own private ends, not one of them joined it as a bishop, with a view to continue the episcopal succession. It

[1] Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. 21.

is true, they were permitted to retain their seats in parliament as one of the ancient estates of the realm; and also to hold their ecclesiastical courts for the despatch of such processes as had from time immemorial been conducted in them. But as to the episcopal succession, our reformers appear either not to have thought of it, or to have attached no importance to it. Yet in this they undoubtedly committed a fundamental error. No set of men, without a direct commission from Heaven, which can only be proved by miracle, can have a right to found a *new church;* nor can any body of Christians belong to Christ's one visible church upon earth, unless they can show their connexion with that instituted by the Apostles, and perpetuated uninterruptedly by their successors. Our reformers had an undoubted right to destroy the papal dominion which the popes had founded; but they had no right to annihilate a ministry which the Apostles themselves had originated. Though, therefore, their practice had been unobjectionable in other respects, yet by their culpability in this, they virtually cut themselves off from the communion of the church Catholic, however they might be acknowledged by contemporaneous sectaries like themselves, or even, for a time, by some true churchmen who were not fully aware of their schismatical condition. But providentially, it was otherwise in England, where the apostolical commission had not only been transmitted from the earliest age, but was carefully perpetuated at the Reformation,—a commission founded upon the express promise of the Saviour to his Apostles and their successors,—"Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."[1]

[1] Appendix IX. The Roman Catholic schoolmen themselves all agree that "non potest papa, episcopo quantumcunque degradato, ordinandi postestatem auferre." See Appendix IX.

CHAPTER XI.

Life and Times of John Hamilton archbishop of St Andrews, from the Reformation in 1560, *till his murder in* 1571.

So sudden was the Reformation in Scotland, and so unpopular did the Roman Catholic bishops all at once become, that as early as June 1560, we find Hamilton afraid to make his appearance in the streets of Edinburgh, through an apprehension of being insulted by the mob. Lord Clinton thus writes from Edinburgh to the Earl of Sussex, of the above date:—"We did offer to the Archbishop of St Andrews a guard to come to the ambassador's, but *he durst not;* and so the French ambassador went into the castell to hym and others." But the following extract of a letter from the primate himself to the Archbishop of Glasgow, who was then in Paris, written two months later, gives us a more lively picture of the disordered state of the times:—"But one thing is, that so long as the new preachers are tolerated, who are not admitted by the Ordinary, but come in by force, or are taken in by towns at their own hands, so that they will not allow any manner of service in the kirk but by themselves, and utterly oppose all others, bishops, abbots, parsons, vicars, who will not do as they do;—therefore your lordship must be diligent to remedy these things, and that no alteration be made of God's service, either in singing or saying of mass, matins, preachings, or sacraments, against the will both of the prelates and the people. But it might be sufficient to any that would be of this new opinion, to use their own conscience with themselves, and not punish

or banish them, but only withhold from them their livings.[1] These preachers are so seditious, that I believe there will be little obedience to authority so long as they have place. As things turn out, I shall advertise your lordship shortly, or send a servant to you. I will endeavour to act agreeably to your wishes. None of the new band will speak or company with us. They openly, in the pulpit, persuade the nobility to put violent hands on, and slay all kirkmen that will not concur and take their opinion; and they openly reproach my lord duke [Chatelherault] that he will not begin first, and either cause me to do as they do, or else use rigour on me by slaughter, sword, or, at least, perpetual imprisonment. And in time, if they are suffered, no man may have life, unless he grant their articles, which I will not;—therefore, provide remedy. I pray your lordship make my commendations to all the French noblemen who are at court, and to my Lord Seyton. Your lordship's at all power. "J. SANCTANDROIS."

It argues a sad state of things when reformation becomes identified with a "reign of terror;" and yet, how often has it been so! It was so with our first Scottish Reformation, and it was equally so, as we shall discover, with what has been strangely called our "Second Reformation," in 1638. But no permanent good can arise from violent changes conducted by unauthorized men, or by unauthorized means. They who sow the wind, will be sure, in the end, to reap the whirlwind.

Hamilton was again in personal danger soon after

1 "This prelate should have thought of this sooner, and granted liberty of conscience when he had more power in his hands. But we see men in power, be they of whatever denomination, are still the same; namely, to carry everything by a high hand."—*Bishop Keith.*

this. The reformers, determined on destroying the religious houses, sent Argyll, Glencairn, and Arran to execute this business in the west. "They burnt Paisley," says Knox; "the Bishop of St Andrews, who was abbot, *narrowly escaped;* they cast down Failfurd, Kilwinning, and part of Crossraguel." It is evident from this, what would have been the poor abbot's fate, had he not "narrowly escaped." He adds, "Thus God so potently wrought with us, so long as we depended upon him, that all the world might see his potent hand to maintain us, and to fight against our enemies." It is not very evident how they showed their dependence upon God: they seem rather to have depended on their own efforts; but it certainly would have been more prudent in Knox to have contented himself with relating the facts, without prejudging the question of the Divine assistance, in an affair which, on the part of man, was conducted with so much turbulence, and the indulgence of so many base passions and propensities.

It is now well known that English intrigue and English gold, were the main-springs of the movements we have been contemplating.[1] The able ambassadors of Queen Elizabeth were diligently fanning the flame, from motives exclusively political. The Lords of the Congregation, besides the rich harvest which many of them were reaping from the dissolved monasteries, were in Elizabeth's pay, and pledged to follow her bidding. The whole of the correspondence with England at this period, which has recently been published, affords the clearest demonstration of this fact; and shows also, that the English ambassadors, so long as

[1] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 433; vol. ii. pp. 68, 76, 217, and *passim*. In truth, we may say, that from the date of the English Reformation till the union of the crowns, the most influential men in Scotland were in the pay of England. Sir James Melville's "Memoirs," pp. 233, 234.

they could induce the reformers to serve their political ends, were not scrupulous as to the means they encouraged them to use, and quite ready to connive at the religious excesses into which they saw them plunging; all the while rejoicing in the subserviency of their dupes. For example, Randolph (the skilful conductor of the secret intrigues between his queen and the congregational lords) thus writes from Hamilton, 12th October 1559, to the English court: "It may please you to credit me, I never saw a greater opportunity to *do good* upon people than presently. *The queen's majesty may have them at her own devotion.*" And, in the same letter: "The Prior of St Andrews sent a letter to the Earl of Arran, that he received out of France, containing many news of the preparation against Scotland, *with advice to seek aid of England; which I guess to savour too much of Knox's style to come from France, though it will serve to good purpose.*"[1] Here he plainly insinuates that Knox and the Lord James had concurred in forging a letter from France, in order to serve their own purposes. Whether he were right in his *guess* may be questioned; but it proves that, from his personal knowledge of the men, he thought them quite capable of such baseness.

In 1561, the archbishop, and such of the prelates as had not joined the Reformation, gave in, by command of the Privy Council, a return of the rental of their benefices, in order that one-third might be deducted from them; they being permitted to enjoy the other two-thirds for the remainder of their lives.[2] This was a more liberal provision than, under the circumstances, could have been expected, and far more so than their Protestant successors received at the Revolution of 1688, who were instantly driven from their homes, and

[1] Sadler's State Papers, vol. ii. p. 35–38.

[2] See Chap. iv. vol. ii.

stript of their ecclesiastical preferments, for no other offence than fidelity to the oath they had taken to their legitimate sovereign. The one-third was given partly to the reformed preachers, and partly to the queen, for defraying the expenses of her household. This division of the spoil was far from being agreeable to John Knox, who thought the preachers entitled to a larger share. He, therefore, publicly declared from the pulpit, that "the measure could never prosper: for that two-thirds were thus given to the devil, and one-third divided between God and the devil."

Nothing is more objectionable in Knox's behaviour, than his practice of speaking evil of the highest dignities, both of church and state, simply because they were of a different creed from his own. Even in his public prayers, he did not scruple to vent calumnies against his enemies, and more especially against his unfortunate queen. In his History of the Reformation, his language is peculiarly offensive. For example, his usual appellation for the Roman Catholic bishops is, "bloody beasts;" and he calls Archbishop Hamilton, from whom he had never received any personal provocation, a "cruel beast," a "bastard bishop;" "that cruel and unmerciful hypocrite, falsely called Bishop of St Andrews;" and, speaking of him before his consecration, he says: "he was not yet *execrate*, *consecrate* they call it." Some writer has observed, that a "Christian should never allow himself to be outdone in good manners." But our Reformer, though not without some good qualities, seemed to try how much he could outdo others in vulgar wit and coarse invective. This may appear a harsh censure; but all who have read his writings will at once admit that it is no more than the truth. It will not do to call these ebullitions the faults of the age rather than of the man. If we admit this excuse, there is no error we may not

justify. The distinction betwixt good and evil is inherent and immutable.

Queen Mary was at St Andrews in April 1562; for we find Randolph, in a letter to Cecil of that date, mentioning that she and the Master of Lindsay, who afterwards treated her so brutally, shot at her favourite pastime of the butts, in her privy garden, against the Earl of Mar and one of her ladies, Randolph himself, and several of the nobility, being present.[1]

On the same occasion, there was a convention held for the trial of the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Arran and Bothwell, and the Commendator of Kilwinning, for an alleged conspiracy against the queen and her brother. The duke exculpated himself; and the other parties were removed to Edinburgh: Bothwell and Kilwinning under the custody of twenty-four horsemen, and Arran "in the queen's own coach."[2] The affair seems to have ended in nothing.

In the following February, we find Mary again at St Andrews, at which time she was only twenty-one years of age. While at Burntisland, on her way to this city, a singular incident occurred. An enthusiastic French poet, named Chatelard, belonging to her suite, obtruded himself into her bedroom, and presented himself before her as she was stepping into bed. The moment he was seen, she and her attendant ladies shrieked for assistance, which brought her brother the Earl of Moray, and some of the courtiers, to her apartment. Glowing with virtuous indignation at this daring and treasonable offence, she commanded

[1] Chalmers' Life of Mary, vol. ii. p. 70. The house in which the queen is supposed to have lived at that time, is one of the two large ones on the south side of the eastern extremity of South Street. Randolph calls it elsewhere, "a merchant's house;" a proof that the merchants of St Andrews were then a much wealthier class than they are now.

[2] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 72.

Moray to stab the culprit on the spot; but he more wisely determined to reserve him for a public trial and execution. Accordingly, he was conveyed to St Andrews, to which city the Chancellor, Justice-Clerk, and other counsellors, were brought from Edinburgh to sit upon his trial. He was condemned to lose his life, and was executed at the market-cross of the city. On the scaffold, he drew from his pocket a volume of Pierre Ronsard, and, after reading that poet's hymn to death, resigned himself to his fate with seeming indifference. Knox, who is always happy to find matter of reproach against his sovereign, more than insinuates that she was guilty of a criminal intercourse with this Chatelard. But the coarse and unbecoming manner in which he expresses himself on the subject, must serve as an antidote to his most uncharitable opinion. The culprit's open trial and public execution, independent of other considerations, ought to exonerate her from the unworthy suspicions of one who delighted to defame her. He concludes his account with these words: "And so Chatelard lacked his head, that his tongue should not utter the secrets of our queen. Deliver us, O Lord, from the rage of such inordinate rulers." With much more reason might he have prayed to be delivered from his own rebellious spirit and uncharitable temper.

Mary remained in St Andrews till the May following, riding about the adjacent parts, and amusing herself with the pastimes of the country. Early next year, she returned to this city, where Randolph, Queen Elizabeth's ambassador, waited upon her, who soon after wrote to his mistress this account of their interview. "May it please your Majesty, immediately after the receipt of your letter to this queen, I repaired to St Andrews. So soon as time served, I did present the same; which being read, and,

as appeared on her countenance, very well liked, she said little to me for that time. The next day she passed wholly in mirth, nor gave any appearance to any of the contrary, nor would not, as she said openly, but be quiet and merry. Her grace *lodged in a merchant's house;* her train were very few, and there was small repair from any part. Her will was, that for the time that I did stay, I should dine and sup with her. Your majesty was oftentimes drunk unto by her at dinners and suppers. Very merrily she passeth her time; after dinner she rideth abroad. It pleaseth her the most part of the time to talk with me." When Randolph introduced the subject of his embassy, which was Mary's own marriage to the Earl of Leicester, he thus describes the way in which she received it: "I had no sooner spoken these words, but she saith, 'I see now well that you are weary of this company and treatment. I sent for you to be merry, and to see how like a *bourgeois* wife I live with my little troop; and you will interrupt our pastime with your grave and great matters. I pray you, Sir, if you be weary here, return to Edinburgh, and keep your gravity until the *queen* come thither; for I assure you, you shall not get her here, nor do I know myself what has become of her; you see neither cloth of state, nor such appearance that you may think there is a queen here; nor would I have you think that I am she at St Andrews, that I was at Edinburgh.' I said that I was very sorry for that, for that at Edinburgh she said that she did love my mistress the Queen's Majesty, better than any other, and now I marvelled how her mind was altered. It pleased her at this to be very merry, and called me by more names than were given me in my Christendom. At these merry conceits, much good sport was made. 'But well, Sir,' saith she, 'that which I then spoke in

words shall be confirmed to my good sister your mistress, in writing; before you go out of this town, you shall have a letter unto her, and, for yourself, go where you will, I care no more for you.' The next day, I was willed to be at my ordinary table, being placed the next person (saving worthy Beton[1]) to the queen's self." Soon after this, poor Mary proceeded to Wemyss castle, where she met Darnley for the first time; her marriage to whom was the beginning of those misfortunes which ended only with her existence.

At the season of Easter, the same year, Archbishop Hamilton, the Prior of Whithorn, and some other dignified clergy, were accused of saying mass, and brought before the Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh, to answer for this violation of the law. The result was, that the accused, rather than submit themselves to a lay court for an ecclesiastical offence, surrendered themselves to the queen's mercy, who, to humour the prosecutors, committed them to prison for a few months, and afterwards released them by her own prerogative. This gave great offence to the Protestant party, and raised a loud cry of partiality against her.

In December 1565, Queen Mary was again in St Andrews, with her husband, at the time the reforming rebel lords, Moray, Morton, Glencairn, Rothes, Boyd, Ochiltree, &c., were in arms against them. "The whole barons and lairds of Fife convoyed her majesty till she came to St Andrews; where the said lairds and barons, especially the Protestants, were commanded to subscribe a bond, containing, in effect, that they obliged themselves to defend the queen and king's persons against Englishmen and rebels; and, in case they should come to Fife, they would resist them to their utmost power; which charge every man

[1] Mary Beaton, niece of the cardinal, who, from her childhood, had been one of the queen's maids of honour.

obeyed.[1] Here their majesties issued a proclamation, the statements in which were fully borne out by facts, and which I will give entire, from the circumstance of its having been drawn up and published at St Andrews. It is distinguished, besides, by good sense and sound principles, and developes the true character and designs of the reformers. As Knox himself (who furnishes the document[2]) says concerning it, "And becaus the same is very notabill, I thocht gude to insert it here, word by word, albeit it be somequhat long." I have modernized the spelling.

"Henry and Mary, by the grace of God, King and Queen of Scots—to all and sundry, our lieges and subjects, whom it may concern, and to whose knowledge these letters shall come, greeting. Forasmuch as in this uproar lately raised against us by certain rebels and their assistants, the authors thereof, to blind the eyes of the simple people, have given them to understand, that the quarrel they have in hand is only religion, thinking with that cloak to cover their ungodly designs, and so, under that plausible argument, to draw after them a large train of ignorant persons easy to be seduced.—Now, for the preservation of our good subjects, (whose case were to be pitied, if they should blindly suffer themselves to be induced and trapped in so dangerous a snare,) it hath pleased the goodness of God, by the utterance of their own mouths and writings to us, to discover the poison that before lay hid in their hearts, albeit, to all persons of clear judgment, the same was evident enough before. For what other thing might move the principal raisers of this tumult to put themselves in arms

[1] Knox's History, p. 383. Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 80. Tytler mentions that, on this occasion, the queen levied a heavy fine on St Andrews and Dundee, vol. vii. p. 8.

[2] History, p. 384.

against us so unnaturally, upon whom we had bestowed so many benefits, but that the great honour we did them, they being thereof unworthy, made them misknow themselves; and their ambition could not be satisfied with heaping riches upon riches, and honour upon honour, unless they retain in their hands, us, and our whole realm, to be led, used, and disposed at their pleasure.[1] But this the multitude could not have perceived, if God, for disclosing their hypocrisy, had not compelled them to utter their unreasonable desire to govern. For now, by letters sent by themselves to us, which make plain profession that the establishing of religion will not content them, but we must be forced to govern by a council such as it shall please them to appoint us; a thing so far beyond all measure, that we think the mention only of so unreasonable a demand, is sufficient to make their nearest kinsfolks their most mortal enemies, and all men to run on them without farther scruple, that are zealous to have their native country to remain still in the state of a kingdom. For what other thing is this, but to dissolve the whole policy, and, in a manner, to invert the very order of nature; to make the prince obey, and subjects command? The like was never demanded by [of?] any of our noble progenitors heretofore, yea, not of governors or regents; but the prince, and such as filled their place, chose their council of such as they thought most fit for the purpose. When we ourselves were of less age, and at our first returning into this our realm, we had the free choice of our council at our pleasure; and now, when we are at our full maturity, shall we be brought back to the state of pupils, and be put under tutory? So long as some of them bore the whole sway with us, this matter was never

[1] All this has immediate reference to Moray, her unnatural half-brother.

called in question; but now when they cannot be longer permitted to do and undo all at their pleasure, they will put a bridle into our mouths, and give us a council chosen after their fantasy! This is the quarrel of religion they made you believe they had in hand. This is the quarrel for which they would have you hazard your lands, lives, and goods, in the company of a certain number of rebels against your natural prince. To speak in good language, they would be kings themselves; or at the least, leaving to us the bare name and title, take to themselves the credit and whole administration of the kingdom. We have thought good to make publication hereof to show, that you suffer not yourselves to be deceived under pretence of religion, to follow those who, preferring their particular advancement to the public tranquillity, and having no care of you in respect of themselves, would, if you would hearken to their voice, draw you after them to your utter destruction. Assuring you, that as you have heretofore good experience of our clemency, and under our wings enjoyed in peace the possession of your goods, and lived at liberty of your conscience, so you may be at full assurance of the like hereafter, and have us always your good and loving princes, to so many as shall continue yourselves in due obedience, and do the office of faithful and natural subjects.—Given under our signet at St Andrews, the 10th day of December, and of our reigns, the first and twenty-third years, 1565."

There can be no doubt that Mary was right, and that the persons against whom this proclamation was issued, Protestants though they called themselves, were wrong. Even had religion been their chief object, the end could not justify the means. But in point of fact, their own love of power, and the selfish policy of Queen Elizabeth, by whom they were encouraged,

supported, and paid, were the governing principles of their conduct. Though the faith in which Mary had been educated cannot be defended, we must at least allow that her fate is worthy of sympathy; and considering how much she endured for conscience' sake, she is fully entitled to the praise of consistency, and even of martyrdom. I make no doubt that her sufferings in this life fitted and prepared her for the happiness of a better.[1]

I cannot avoid here remarking, that her unfortunate grandson, Charles I., seventy-four years after this, at the end of his "Large Declaration" against the rebel Covenanters, had occasion to use nearly the same language as the foregoing, with equal reason, and under circumstances strikingly similar. The Scottish subjects of both sovereigns had rebelled against them in their absence, and overturned the established church of the land. Both had forgiven them; and not only consented to the establishment of a religion which they disapproved, but loaded their enemies with favours, in the hope of conciliating them. Both had been persuaded to alienate, from motives of expediency, the property of the Church from its legitimate use. Both had met with a most ungrateful return, and, supported by England, been rebelled against a second time; and lastly, both perished on an English scaffold, through the perfidy of their subjects; while those subjects, as the just punishment for their sins, were left to "eat the fruit of their own ways, and be filled with their own devices:" for never

[1] The Letters of Mary, lately published by Miss Strickland, and Tytler's deeply interesting account of her behaviour during her imprisonment, and at her death, literally speak volumes in her favour. Who would not rather have been the pious, though cruelly used, captive than the wretched murderess who, after tormenting her, tried to have her secretly assassinated, to save herself the disgrace of a public execution!

did any country suffer more than Scotland did, under the misgovernment of the four regents, during the minority of James VI; and again, under the tyranny, cruelty, and intolerance of the grand rebellion.

Against the secret machinations of Elizabeth, aided by a traitorous nobility, and a mutinous Kirk, it was impossible for a feeble princess like Mary, long to contend successfully. As a matter of expediency, therefore, she yielded for the present to the force which she felt herself unable to resist, and thus postponed a doom which she could not avert.

In 1566, we find Archbishop Hamilton officiating at the baptism of the infant James at Stirling; on which occasion, to oblige the queen, a sort of compromise was entered into, by which the ceremonies of the Romish Church were permitted to be used, "the spittle excepted, which the queen did inhibit." The primate was assisted by his brethren, the Bishops of Dunkeld, Dunblane, and Ross; and the few Scottish noblemen who still adhered to the ancient faith were present. Several ambassadors from foreign courts were also in attendance; but those only of the Papal creed went into the church, while the Protestants remained at the door. After the ceremony, the English ambassador and the Earl of Moray proceeded to St Andrews. The Countess of Argyll, (half-sister to Queen Mary, and god-mother to the Prince on behalf of Queen Elizabeth,) for merely holding the child in her arms at this popish solemnity, was afterwards compelled to do open penance, clothed in a white sheet, in this very church! Such were the times, and such, we may add, was the power of the Protestant party, even at this early period of the Reformation. The archbishop himself little thought, at the time he was officiating, that in five years afterwards he was to be hanged on a common gibbet in the same town, and

dressed, out of mockery, in his canonical robes; yet, so it was!

Towards the close of the same year, the reformed communities of Geneva, Berne, and Basle, sent to the Kirk of Scotland their Confession of Faith, "desiring to know if they agreed in uniformity of doctrine; alleging that the Kirk of Scotland was dissonant in some articles from them. Wherefore, the superintendants, with a great part of the other most qualified ministers, convened in St Andrews, and, reading the said letters, made answer and sent word again, that they agreed on all points with those churches, and differed in nothing from them: albeit in the *keeping of some festival days* our church assented not, for only the Sabbath-day was kept in Scotland."[1] It did not occur to our reformers, that the fourth commandment of the Decalogue being the only one which is not renewed under the Christian dispensation, and the change of day resting solely on the authority of the Church Catholic from the apostolic age, they were equally bound by the same authority in regard to the observance of primitive holidays. Besides, all Christians are equally concerned in the events which those days are designed to commemorate. In the non-observance of such days, the Presbyterian establishment of Scotland stands unhappily distinguished from every Reformed Church in Christendom. This is a reproach which many of her own members would wish to see effaced. The reformers could not plead "the inclinations of the people" in this instance; for so much attached had the people become to the observance of the said days, from long usage, that their new spiritual guides found a difficulty in abolishing them. As a proof of this, the records of the General Assembly for the

[1] Knox, p. 399.

year 1577, show the following question and answer: "Q. What shall be done to ministers and readers that at such times in Lent, or upon Saints' days, as they call them, *or Yule, and Pasch, and such superstitious times*, read, preach, or minister the communion, to retain the people in blindness? A. The visiter, with the Synodal Assembly, ought to admonish such minister or reader to desist and abstain therefrom, under pain of deprivation; and if they disobey, to deprive them."[1] Strange, that a community calling itself Christian, should punish its members for commemorating the birth, crucifixion, and resurrection of their Saviour!

The next year, we find our archbishop present at a ceremony from which he would have acted more wisely in absenting himself, namely, the marriage of Mary to Bothwell; but unhappily he had been one of those who recommended this incongruous union, and had even assisted in promoting a divorce between that earl and his first wife. This is the greatest blot in his character; unless we are to believe the English ambassador Throckmorton, that, with the rest of the Hamiltons, he was prepared to sacrifice Mary to their selfish designs, while she was imprisoned in Lochleven castle. The story comes from an enemy; it is told to Queen Elizabeth, to whom he knew it would be agreeable; and it is utterly at variance with the whole of the archbishop's conduct.[2]

The battle of Langside was fought in May 1568, which, it is well known, ended in the defeat of the unfortunate queen. Archbishop Hamilton was with her on this occasion: and when, after the loss of the day, they had repaired to Dundrennan abbey, and she was considering of taking refuge from her enemies by throwing herself into the hands of Elizabeth, he ear-

[1] Calderwood, p. 68.

[2] Tytler, vol. vii. pp. 172, 173.

nestly entreated her, though without effect, not to trust herself with one who had often before deceived her. He accompanied her to the edge of the Solway, and, seeing her determination to leave her own kingdom, followed her into the boat, and conjured her to return by every argument which his agitated mind could suggest. Finding his efforts vain, he took a final and melancholy leave, as if he had had a presentiment of the violent death which awaited both her and himself. His next concern was his own personal safety, which he had no means now left of providing for, but by seeking shelter among his friends who, though depressed by their recent defeat, were still numerous and powerful.

The same month in which the Regent Moray had gained this victory over the queen, "he maid progress first to Stirling, whare four priests of Dumblayne war condemnit to the death, for saying of mass aganis the act of Parliament; but he remitted their lyvis, and causit thayme be bound to the mercat croce, with their vestments and chalices in derisioun, whare the people caist eggis and other villaine at their faces be the space of ane hour, and thereafter their vestments and chalices war brynt to ashes. From this he passed to Sanctandrois, whare a notabill sorceress callit Nicneville, was condemnit to the death, and brynt; and a Frenchman, callit Paris, who was ane of the devysers of the King's [Darnley's] death, was hangit in Sanctandrois, and with him [Sir] William Stewart, Lyon King of Arms, for dyvers points of witcheraft and necromancie."[1] The common name of the sorceress here alluded to, was "Mother Nicniven," and is the person described by Sir Walter Scott, in "The Abbot," as having assisted Queen Mary in making

[1] Historie of King James the Sext, pp. 40, 41.

her escape from Lochleven castle. Sir W. Stewart was said to have been engaged in a plot against Moray's life. The latter, to make a show of mercy, pardoned him for that offence, but immediately got him burnt for witchcraft![1] Birrel, in his diary, states, that the same year, the regent "raid to St Androis, and caused drown a man named Alexander Mackie, and six more, for piracie." In truth, the regent's cruelty was excessive. He was not content with destroying a solitary witch, here and there, but he burnt them by troops. "In my lord regentis passing to the north, he causit burne certane witches in Sanctandrois; and in his returning, he causit burne *ane uther companie of witches* in Dundee."[2] Which was worse, the burning of witches, or the burning of heretics? The case of every heretic makes a great display in the page of history, while the burning of a whole company of witches is disposed of in a single sentence!

But I must return to the unfortunate primate, and trace his history to its tragical termination. It will be remembered that the regent had been the prior of the archiepiscopal monastery at St Andrews, and owed his archbishop, therefore, canonical obedience before the Reformation; and though that tie was now dissolved, yet no changes should ever have made him forget the respect due to him who had been his ecclesiastical superior. Notwithstanding, one of his first acts after the battle of Langside, was to proclaim the archbishop a traitor, on account of his adherence to the cause of the queen, which subjected him to the punishment of death. Yet it would appear that early in 1569, a temporary truce was patched up between the regent and the Hamiltons, the allusion to which in the Diurnal of Occurrents is brief and obscure.[3]

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 146. [2] Ibid. p. 145.
[3] P. 142.

The regent, the Duke of Chatelherault, the archbishop, and the Lords Cassillis and Herries, went to see the infant king in the castle of Stirling; into which place the three last-mentioned entered themselves as hostages to the regent, for the release of the prisoners taken at Langside, till they should be relieved by others. The primate did not probably remain long in confinement; but whatever might be the regent's ultimate designs in regard to him, they were unexpectedly arrested by his own fate. He was shot at Linlithgow, in January 1570, by one of the Hamiltons, in revenge for a wanton oppression which he had ordered to be inflicted on the wife of the murderer.[1]

The archbishop in the meantime, after lurking for two or three years among his friends, at length fled for security to the stronghold of Dumbarton; at the taking of which fortress, he fell into the hands of as cruel an enemy as Moray himself, namely, the new regent Lennox. When he was taken, he had on his mail shirt and steel cap, in which condition he was immediately carried to Stirling, under a strong guard. He was allowed no trial, but was condemned to death solely on the ground of the forfeiture laid on him as a traitor. Yet there was an investigation held by his enemies, as to some charges brought against him by Lord Ruthven, the Lord Justice-Clerk, and George Buchanan. In support of one of these, (viz., his accession to the murder of the king,) a priest was produced who boldly asserted that he had confessed a servant of the primate, who had declared to him on his deathbed, that he had assisted at the said murder by command of his master. The truth of this the archbishop utterly denied, affirming that he never had any

[1] This unfortunate woman was, by Moray's order, sent naked out of her own house of Woodhouselee, in a cold winter night, in consequence of which she became insane. See the Staggering State, p. 52.

such servant as the priest described; and that the priest had sinned deadly, either in revealing the secrets of the confessional, if true, or in forging them, if false. The only charge the primate admitted was, that he had known of the late regent's intended murder, and had taken no steps to hinder it, for which he was now sorry, and begged God's forgiveness. He was then publicly hanged on a gibbet erected for the purpose at the market-cross of the town, on the 1st April, 1571.[1] "This," says Skinner, "was a silly and unmanly stroke of family revenge in Lennox, who had the execution hurried on in such an unbecoming manner, lest the Queen of England should have interceded for the unhappy primate. There is some ground to suspect that the Earl of Morton, who had been gaping for the revenues of St Andrews, and who managed Lennox as he pleased, had been the chief promoter of the primate's hasty fate: for, immediately upon his death, he solicited so strongly for the rich temporalities of that see, and by threatening to leave the court in case of a refusal, so overawed Lennox, who could not do without him, that he obtained a gift of them, which, through all the various forms of polity which ensued, he took care not to part with."[2] This grant of the revenues of the primacy to a regicide, was a frightful application of property which had been bequeathed for far other purposes, and incomparably worse than

[1] Hamilton's seal has in the centre, St Andrew holding his cross before him. On his right, is a figure holding something like a boar's head in his hand; and on his left, a bishop with a crosier in the act of benediction—all three under rich canopies. The family shield is below, with the motto "misericordia et pax." The circumscription, "S. R. D. Johis. S. Andreæ archiepi. regni Scotie primat. cum ptate (potestate) à latere s. sedis aplice. legati."

[2] Queen Elizabeth, and her crafty ambassador "Master Randolphe," always on the watch to keep up "the balance of power" between the contending parties in Scotland, in order to promote their own objects, used secret measures to obtain the archbishopric for Morton.—*Sir James Melville's Memoirs*, pp. 236, 243.

anything that had been practised before the Reformation. I may here add, that Lord Claud Hamilton, in revenge for the murder of his uncle the archbishop, instigated one Calder to kill the Regent Lennox a few months after, in this same town of Stirling. We have seen a reformation in religion, but cannot as yet discover any improvement in morals.

It is astonishing how little sympathy historians have shown for the fate of Archbishop Hamilton. Dr Cook, indeed, expresses a very becoming indignation at what he properly calls the "savage and tyrannical" conduct of his enemies. And Mackenzie says, "He was a wise, learned, and devout churchman, a loyal, active, and faithful subject, and the death which he suffered an eternal reproach on the memories of those who had a hand in it; who, though they had no regard for his great age, yet ought to have shown some for the sacred character which he bore, if anything sacred had been esteemed by them." But the generality of our Scottish historians have allowed themselves to be carried away by the popular prejudice against Hamilton—and, may we not add—against his predecessor, Cardinal Beaton. It is true, they were both Roman Catholic prelates; but so were their illustrious predecessors, Trail, Wardlaw, and Kennedy. Their greatest crime was their being accessory to the burning of men for being guilty of what was then deemed heresy. But let us do them common justice. No one, in the present times, will for a moment venture to defend such sanguinary proceedings; but we should remember that the heretics, as they were called, were tried and executed for breaking the existing laws of their country, and that they suffered no more than those laws directed. We ought, therefore, rather to condemn the law, than those who carried it into execution. Besides, there can be no doubt that both they

who made, and they who executed the law against heretics, believed they were doing God service. Nor ought it to be forgotten that their Protestant successors decreed the penalty of death to those who were present a third time, at the celebration of mass; and though prevented by circumstances from inflicting this sentence, yet they often inflicted punishments nearly as severe; such as standing in the pillory, banishment, confiscation of goods, imprisonment, and excommunication with all its fearful penalties and privations. "Mass," says Tytler, "was celebrated secretly in many private houses; and when this was found dangerous, the votaries of the Romish faith fled to the woods and mountains, where, amidst their silent solitudes, they adhered to the worship of their fathers. Upon this, the Presbyterians, despairing, as they alleged, of any redress of such abuse from the queen, took the law into their own hands, pursued and seized some priests, and sent word to the Romish clergy, that henceforward they would neither complain to the queen or council, but with their own hands execute upon idolators the punishment contained in God's word."[1] The truth is, there were as bad or worse men than Hamilton and Beaton, even among the reformers. Their murderers surely were worse men. Crichton of Brunstone was a worse man; so was Henry Balnevis, Lord Morton, the Regent Moray, Sir George Douglas, and some others that might be named. As to the private faults of the two primates, I strongly suspect that we should never have heard of them, had they joined the reformers; but even admitting their truth, that could be no justification of their murder;[2]

[1] Vol. vi. p. 326.

[2] Hamilton has been charged with the crime of adultery: but his accusers, Knox and Buchanan, betray so much prejudice against the man, that their testimony cannot be relied on. The former, who had broken his own vows of chastity, says of him, "After he had taken

and besides, their liberal endowment of St Mary's college, St Andrews, should alone have exempted them from their ignominious fate. Finally, may we not balance against the burning of heretics in the sixteenth, the burning of witches in the seventeenth century—the murder, public or private, of David Rizzio—of three sovereigns, namely, Darnley, Mary, and their grandson, Charles I.—of one Archbishop of Canterbury—of three Archbishops of St Andrews—of the royalist prisoners taken when fighting for their king during the grand rebellion—and the attempted murder of the Bishops of Edinburgh and Galloway, for the offence of reading the liturgy? all which was done by ultra-Protestants. I am no apologist for the errors of Romanists; but I think that they who live in glass houses should not be the first to throw stones.

But we must now return, and observe the progress of the Reformation at St Andrews.

the castles of Edinburgh and Dunbar, he also took possession of his enemy's wife, the Lady Stenhouse. The woman is, and has been famous, and is called Lady Gilston. Her ladyship was holden always in property; but how many wives and virgins he has had since that in common, the world knows, albeit not all, and his bastard birds bears some witness: such is the example of holiness that the flock may receive of these papistical bishops." It is clear, I think, that such testimony is inadmissible, especially as we happen to know that the above Hamilton of Stenhouse was the relation and friend, not the "enemy" of the archbishop.—*Balfour*, vol. i. p. 279. Less exceptionable writers, however, speak, some of a daughter, others of a son, and others again of three sons, whom he left. According to Mackenzie, he married the daughter of Lord Semple before he entered into holy orders, by whom he had a son who legally succeeded to his property, which he could not have done had he been illegitimate. Douglas, in his Peerage, says nothing of this marriage, but states that Margaret, daughter of Lord Semple, married John Hamilton of Broomhill. May not this person have been confounded with the archbishop? To increase the difficulty, Randolph, (no friend of the archbishop, be it remembered,) in a letter to Sir R. Sadler, written from Hamilton, in October, 1559, says, "The Lord Semple's daughter, whom he [the archbishop] hath loved so long, sueth to marry him. She is presently here. Her father will not promise what part he will take."—*Sadler's State Papers*, vol. ii. p. 38. I leave the reader to reconcile these conflicting accounts as well as he is able.

Those of the Romish priests who adopted the tenets of Protestantism, and such other preachers as could be procured, without the least regard to their having been ordained or not, provided only they were thought *qualified*, were distributed in different parts of Scotland, to supply the spiritual wants of the people; but, for the present, only *eight* of the chief towns of Scotland could be supplied with *one minister each*; the rest being irregularly provided with an inferior class of lay functionaries called exhorters and readers, who were empowered to preach and read prayers, but not to administer the sacraments. The minister who was appointed to St Andrews was the Reverend Christopher Goodman. This ecclesiastic was of English orders, and had met with John Knox at Geneva, whither they had both fled to avoid the Marian persecution. Goodman afterwards accompanied Knox to Scotland, and assisted him in bringing about the Reformation; and more particularly in drawing up what was called "The Book of Common Order," a liturgy on the Genevan model, which was adopted by the Kirk of Scotland in the year 1564, that of the reformed Church of England having been in use up to that date.[1]

Here then was a singular change for St Andrews in the course of a few months. In June 1559, there were in the city, an archbishop and various church dignitaries connected with the cathedral, thirty or forty chaplains of private altarages, a prior, sub-prior, and thirty-four canons of the Augustinian monastery, the provost and twelve prebendaries of Kirkheugh, the friars of the Dominican and Franciscan monasteries, and the numerous clergy connected with the three colleges, who were exempted from residence on their

[1] A new edition of this "Book of Common Order" has recently been published.

benefices because of this connexion,—in all, probably, exceeding one hundred and sixty ecclesiastics and monks; and now, Mr Christopher Goodman was the only ordained Protestant minister to whom a population of twelve or fifteen thousand people could apply for religious instruction and the administration of the sacraments! Nor do they seem to have had more for several years afterwards. At the same time, it should be observed, that Goodman was under the spiritual superintendence of Wynram, who had been made Superintendant of Fife. He *may* also have had under him an exhorter or a reader, and one or two converted canons of the priory; though, if he had, they were not necessarily in holy orders, and, from their recluse habits, must have been very indifferently qualified to perform the duties of parish ministers. It is right also to add, that when Goodman appeared at the General Assembly in 1560, he had with him two lay-elders from St Andrews, David Spens and Robert Kynpont.[1]

During Goodman's abode at St Andrews, he contributed his utmost efforts to promote the cause of Reformation; but, while so employed, his intolerant, ultra-Protestant, and even sanguinary character, is strikingly displayed in a letter which he had occasion

[1] Even in the year 1572, there were only 252 ministers, 157 exhorters, and 508 readers, (all laymen except three or four,) for the whole of Scotland; Mr Robert Hamilton, minister, and Mr George Black, exhorter, being all that could be afforded for St Andrews. See a "Register of Ministers, Exhorters, and Readers" for that period, printed by the Maitland Club. It is there stated, that so scarce was the first class of instructors, that one individual was appointed to "*minister the sacraments to the haill schyre of Peebles!*" To these facts it may be added, that when Andrew Melville came to St Andrews in 1582, there were only five ministers in that presbytery, though when he left it there were sixteen.—*M'Crie's Life of Melville*, vol. i. p. 342. There ought to have been twenty. It was many years before the country could adapt itself to the new state of things; and in the interval, great religious destitution and incalculable disorder prevailed.

to write to Cecil, wherein he exhorts that statesman to "abolish all the relics of superstition and idolatry, which, to the grief and scandal of the godly, were still retained in England; and not to suffer the bloody bishops and known murderers of God's people and your dear brethren *to live*, on whom God hath expressly pronounced the sentence of death, for the execution of which he hath committed the sword into your hands, who are now placed in authority."[1] Goodman did not remain many years at St Andrews. As he had more work laid upon him by the General Assembly than he liked, or could easily perform, and as he was often sent to distant parts of the country to supply the deficiencies of others, he seems to have grown tired of his situation, for he finally returned to England in the year 1565. But before parting with this reformer, I may add that, in 1558 he published a book at Geneva, entitled "How supreme powers ought to be obeyed by their subjects, and wherein they may, by God's word, be lawfully disobeyed and resisted." In this work, he, in common with his friend Knox, condemned "the monstrous regiment of women," and contended for doctrines incompatible with monarchical government, or indeed with any government; which doctrines he held and acted upon while employed in reforming the Church in Scotland. But when he returned to England, the jealousy of Elizabeth's government obliged him, as it had previously obliged Knox, to recant his democratic opinions as publicly as he had avowed them. Towards the end of his life, he was exposed to some trouble on account of his puritanical principles, and finally died at Chester about the year 1602.[2] But it would surely

[1] Tytler, vol. vi. p. 217.

[2] Fuller, in his Church History, says of Goodman, "Well were it if it might be truly said of him what was said of Probus the emperor,

have been better if both he and Knox had written more guardedly, or thought more wisely, on political subjects, than to subject themselves to the humiliating necessity of publicly acknowledging their error. They should have remembered, that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" and that, as sovereigns, when they stretch their prerogative too far, only "kick against the pricks," and thereby injure themselves,—so, on the other hand, God and nature and the fundamental principles of the constitution have placed such barriers around the throne, that when subjects restrain the sovereign within narrower limits, they make the remedy worse than the disease, and give birth to the most frightful consequences.

It was Knox's wish to appoint over the Protestant functionaries, twelve superintendants with one thousand marks each, and a proportionate salary to the inferior ministers;[1] but this was thought too expensive an establishment by those who had got the church revenues into their hands, and were unwilling to part with them. The Reformer was, therefore, obliged to content himself with five superintendants at reduced incomes; the district of Fife and Strathearn being assigned to Wynram, and Knox himself acting as overseer of the whole, though without any official authority or distinguishing title. These appointments on the part of the reformers, whatever might be the defects inherent in them, sufficiently prove that they were no friends to that system of *parity* which their successors adopted; for to these superintendants, as

that he was *vir sui nominis*. Sure it is that, living beyond the seas in the days of Queen Mary, he wrote a book stuffed with much dangerous doctrine."—Book ix. p. 77. See a copy of Goodman's Recantation, Appendix XLIV.

[1] Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 281. A merk Scots was only 13⅓d.; but, owing to the greater value of money at that time, 1000 merks would equal £550 in modern days.

much, and in some respects more, power was assigned over the inferior ministers than the bishops themselves exercised, under either the Papal or Episcopal systems, with the single but very important exception of ordination, which, as we have already seen, was abolished altogether. Yet so true was Knox to his principle, that "the people" are the source of all power, ecclesiastical as well as civil, that not only did he give the General Assembly control over the superintendants, but even the elders of their own parish churches (for each was obliged to have a parish in addition to his other duties) were authorized to call them to account, and censure them, whenever they saw, or thought they saw, reason for doing so! Such an incongruous system as this, did not, and could not last.[1]

In his History of the Reformation, Knox states that "there was none within the realm more unmerciful to the puir ministers, than were they who had the grittest rents of the kirks." In reply to these just complaints of these "puir ministers," the unmerciful plun-

[1] It may be here remarked, that the reformers were friendly to lay patronage; for, in an address to the queen in the year 1565, they distinctly state, "Our mind is, not that her majesty, or any other patron of this realm, should be deprived of their just patronages; but we mean, that whensoever her majesty or any other patron does present any person to a benefice, the person presented should be tried and examined by the judgment of the learned men of the kirk, such as presently are the Superintendents, who are appointed thereto. As the presentation to benefices pertains to the patron, so the collation ought, in law and reason, to pertain to the Kirk; of which collation the Kirk should not be defrauded more than the patrons of their presentation." *Petrie*, p. 344. It was the *intrusion* into benefices without the concurrence of the Kirk at all, of which she was justly jealous, and not what *now* passes under that name. Democratic as the reformers were, in many respects, they never dreamed of giving to the people the arbitrary power to say, in regard to the appointment of their ministers, "sic volumus, sic jubemus, stat pro ratione voluntas." This is the language, not of reason or equity, but of caprice and tyranny; and it does not alter the case, whether the tyrant be one, or a hundred, or a "majority of male communicants."

derers told them that their petition for a share in the church rents was a "devout imagination"! In truth, the ministers contributed to bring this treatment upon their own heads. They had declaimed against the appropriation of so much wealth to sacred purposes: the nobility thought as they did, and took most of it to themselves; and having thus got the lion's share of the spoil, they had no mind to part with it. As Dr Robertson observes, "it was found more easy to kindle zeal than to extinguish avarice." The reformers accused the Romanists of idolatry, and justified their conduct in extirpating it, by a reference to the command given to the Jews of old; but if covetousness be idolatry, which we are assured by the Highest authority it is, it would be difficult to say whether the reformed or the unreformed were the greater idolaters. There was, at least, one point in which the resemblance failed: The Jews were forbidden to touch the gold and silver ornaments which belonged to the idolatrous worship, or even so much as to *desire* them;[1] whereas, the reformers seized them with avidity; and in so doing, must be considered as either virtually withdrawing the charge of idolatry, or as pleading guilty of sacrilege. Indeed, the Governor of Scotland had told Sir R. Sadler, so early as the year 1543, "there be so many great men in this kingdom that are papists, that unless the sin of *covetousness* bring them into it (*i. e.* unless the hope of getting the church lands make them reformers) I know no other means to win them to this purpose."[2]

"The Book of the Universall Kirk of Scotland," as it is singularly called, (in other words, the records of the General Assembly from the Reformation downwards,) furnishes sad proofs of the disorder, immo-

[1] Deut. vii. 25, 26.

[2] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 128.

rality, and intolerance which prevailed throughout Scotland at the period we are now reviewing. We there read of numberless cases of fornication, adultery, and incest, some of them of a very disgusting character. Indeed, impurity seems to have been the besetting sin of Scotland at this time. In Perth alone, whose population did not exceed six thousand, there were, on an average, eighty convicted cases of adultery annually, even under the superintendence of Mr Row, its first Protestant minister. And Mr Petrie informs us, that in 1569, a report was made to the General Assembly, that in Orkney there were six hundred persons convicted of incest, adultery, or fornication. In the same records we read of complaints against all the five superintendents, and many of the ministers, for various delinquencies, but especially pluralities, non-residence, and negligence in visiting their charges; and at one of the sittings of the Assembly, twenty-seven ministers were complained of by name, that "they had wasted the patrimony of their benefices, and made no residence at their kirks."[1] We find also frequent petitions for more superintendants or commissioners of kirks, more money to pay them, more kirks to preach in, and more manses to live in: and not a few from the parishes to which the superintendants were attached, that their spiritual concerns were neglected; and, to take a case connected with St Andrews, the parishioners of Tyningham complained, that while they paid their tithes to St Mary's college, "neither word nor sacraments were dispensed among them." We read of some ministers throwing up their office, and resorting to civil employments for want of a livelihood; and others expressing their wish to do the same, but forbidden by the

[1] Book of the Universall Kirk, with Calderwood's additions, p. 376.

Assembly; and, what is curious, we find the following question recorded as gravely proposed and answered:—"*Q.* Whether a minister or reader may tap ale, beer, or wine, and keep an open tavern? *A.* A minister or reader who taps ale, beer, or wine, and keeps an open tavern, should be exhorted by the commissioners to *keep decorum*."[1] In short, we discover instances of the prevalence of all kinds of vice, and of those who committed them promising to amend, but seldom performing,—instances of readers usurping the office of ministers by dispensing the sacraments,—of papists commanded to join themselves to the new establishment, on pain of excommunication,—of orders to suppress all heretical books, and not to allow them to be imported or printed,—compulsory abolition of the fasts and festivals of the church,—Sundays to be kept as fast days,—refusal of lay commendators to pay their thirds of benefices,—simony, &c., &c.[2] I will give one extract more from this curious record. The Commendator of Holyrood was complained of by the General Assembly in 1570, that "all the said kirks [the twenty-seven belonging to the abbey] for the maist part wherein Christis Evangell may be preachit, are decayit, and made, some sheepfalds, and some sa ruinous that nane dare enter into them, for fear of falling, especially Halyrudhous; although the Bishop of Sanct Androws in time of papistry, sequestrat the hail rentis of the said abbacy, becaus only the glassen windows were not holden up and repairit."

The following extract, from a sermon preached at Leith by Mr David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline, before the Regent Mar, the General Assembly, and many of the nobility, in January 1571, strikingly

[1] Book of the Universall Kirk, p. 378. [2] Ibid., *passim*.

confirms the foregoing account of the state of religion in Scotland at the period in question:—

"Then, the same accusations and complaints that God used of old by his prophet against the Jews, serve this day against them that are like the Jews in transgression; yea, they serve against us. For this day Christ is spoiled amongst us, while that which ought to maintain the ministry of the kirk and the poor, is given to profane men, flatterers in court, ruffians, and hirelings: the poor, in the meantime, oppressed with hunger, the kirks and temples decaying for lack of ministers and upholding, and the schools utterly neglected. But now to speak of your temples, where the word of God should be preached, and the sacraments ministered—all men see to what miserable ruin and decay they are come; yea, they are so profaned that, in my conscience, if I had been brought up in Germany, or in any other country where Christ is truly preached, and all things done decently and in order, according to God's Word, and heard of that purity of religion that is among you, and for the love thereof had taken travel to visit this land, and then should have seen the foul deformity and desolation of your kirks and temples, *which are more like sheep-cots than the house of God*,—I could not have judged that there had been any fear of God or right religion in the most part of this realm. And as for the ministers of the Word, they are utterly neglected, and come in manifest contempt among you: ye rail upon them at your pleasure. Of their doctrine, if it serve not your turn, and agree not with your appetites, ye are become impatient; and, to be short, we are now made your table-talk, whom ye mock in your mirth, and threaten in your anger. This is what moves me (let men judge as they list) to lay before your eyes the miserable estate of the poor Kirk of Scotland, that thereby ye

may be provoked to pity it, and to restore the things that unjustly ye spoiled it of. Cleanse, then, your hands of all impiety, *specially of sacrilege*, whereby ye spoiled the poor, the schools, the temples, and ministers of God's word, yea, Christ himself. I grant that our fathers, out of their immoderate zeal, besides the teinds and necessary rents of the Kirk, gave thereunto superfluously, and more than enough. What, then, is to be done? but that the preachers of God's word be reasonably sustained; (seeing that there is enough and too much for that purpose;) the schools and the poor be well provided, as they ought; and the temples honestly and reverently repaired, that the people may, without injury from wind and weather, sit and hear God's word, and participate in his holy sacraments; and, if there rest anything unspent when this is done, (as no doubt there will,) in the name of God let it be bestowed on the next necessary affairs of the commonwealth, and not to any man's private commodity."

The above sermon was printed at St Andrews the following year. It was read and approved by John Knox, who was near his latter end at the time, and who thus attested his opinion of it: "John Knox, with my dead hand, but glad heart, praising God that, of his mercy, he leaves such light to his Kirk *in this desolation*."

Making every allowance for the confusion arising out of a new order of things, one cannot help concluding, from a review of the preceding statements, that there was a radical defect in the whole system of the Scottish Reformation; and that defect seems to have been, in the reformers not being prepared with a well-ordered and apostolic system, to substitute for the one they overthrew. This was suggested to Knox by Archbishop Hamilton himself. Soon after the Reformation had commenced, he sent to him one John

Brand, a monk of Holyrood, to tell him that "albeit he had innovated in many things, and made reformation of the doctrine of the Church, whereof he could not deny there was some reason; yet *he should do wisely to retain the old policy which had been the work of many ages, or else put a better in its place, which his new model was far from:* that our Highlandmen have a custom, when they break young colts, to fasten them by the head with strong tethers, which they keep very fast till they be thoroughly tamed. The multitude must be so dealt with. Mr Knox, I know, esteemeth me an enemy; but tell him from me he shall find it true." The archbishop, I presume, meant by this to say, that Knox's favourite doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, was just as absurd and impracticable as the sovereignty of colts, and that the one needed to be *tethered* as much as the other. The Reformer, who thought he knew much better than "that cruel beast falsely called the Bishop of St Andrews," (p. 348.) paid no attention to this advice, but pursued his headlong course; but I have no doubt he regretted he had not followed it, when he attested the truth of the statements in Mr Ferguson's sermon—"*in this desolation.*" In short, our reformers, instead of sweeping away, should have purified the Roman Catholic Church, the admirable machinery of which was already prepared to their hands; and, above all, they should have avoided the fatal error of abolishing the canonical ordination of the priesthood, and the consequent distinction between the clergy and laity. They should have adhered to the example of the Church in its purest period: the system which had been adopted by the "one Catholic and apostolic church," at all times, in all places, and by all her faithful members. Thus would they have avoided the dangers and difficulties into which they speedily fell; their successors would

have escaped the changes to which they have ever since been subjected; and, instead of a "violent and disordered Reformation," as Spotswood justly calls it, we should have had, as England had, a Reformation worthy of the name; one not rashly undertaken by rapacious barons, at the head of an ignorant and fanatical populace, but conducted by wise counsellors and learned prelates.

CHAPTER XII.

History of St Andrews from the Murder of Archbishop Hamilton, in 1571, *till the Death of Patrick Adamson, titular Archbishop of St Andrews, and the Establishment of Presbyterianism in* 1592.

But now a partial change in the constitution and government of the Kirk was at hand, consisting of an apparent, though far from a real, approximation to Episcopacy. In the year 1571-2, the Estates of the realm assembled at Leith, and declared that "the name and office of archbishop and bishop should be continued during the king's minority, and these dignities be conferred upon the best qualified among the Protestant ministers; but that, with regard to their spiritual jurisdiction, they should be subject to the General Assembly of the Church." In conformity with this decision, all the old sees were filled with titular bishops and chapters, except Aberdeen and Ross, whose Roman Catholic bishops were yet alive, and who, it was agreed, should not be dispossessed. This was, in fact, no more than an enlargement of the su-

perintendant scheme, unless we regard it as an attempt to supersede it; for we find that some of the old superintendants had soon reason to complain that their privileges were invaded by the new bishops, and that their salaries were more irregularly paid than before; whereupon the General Assembly, before whom they laid their complaint, gave in an entreaty to the Regent Morton, that their rights and emoluments might be respected.

No praise is, I think, due either to the State or the Church for this new arrangement, though it looked like a return to a better state of things. Dr M'Crie says, "it was disapproved by the ministers of the church." Of this I have discovered no proof; for why did they concur in it, if they disapproved of it? But he is more correct when he adds, "on the part of the courtiers and nobility, it does not appear to have proceeded from a predilection to hierarchical government, but from the desire which they had to secure to themselves the revenues of the church." The bishops thus created, were sarcastically named *tulchan* bishops, from a practice then in use, of stuffing calf-skins with straw, called "tulchan calves," for the purpose of inducing the mother-cow to give her milk. So the lay peers of Scotland at this time, put certain ministers into the vacant bishopries; and through their means, for the consideration of a limited income, drew the greater part of their revenues, or obtained advantageous leases of church lands! These prelates possessed a very circumscribed ecclesiastical jurisdiction. They exercised, indeed, some episcopal functions, and they presided at diocesan meetings of their clergy; but they were subject to the authority of the General Assembly, which soon began to regard them with jealousy, and sought every opportunity of making them sensible of their inferior and dependent condition. Nothing, in fact,

could be more discreditable to all parties than such a state of things;—to the nobility, who thus openly practised the most shameful sacrilege; to the tulchan bishops, who simoniacally sold themselves to uphold it; and to the reformed Kirk, which tolerated such an abominable nuisance. Knox, who was by this time near his latter end, saw and lamented the evil; but he was unable to prevent it. He had found it a much easier matter to begin a reformation than to finish it, and to create a popular movement than to control it. But we must inquire how this tulchan scheme proceeded at St Andrews.

The Earl of Morton who, as we have seen, had obtained a gift of the temporalities of the see, in order that he might enjoy them in some sort of legal manner, made choice of an old man, John Douglas, principal of St Mary's College, and rector of the university, and agreed to put him into the archbishopric, on the condition of drawing, through him, by far the greater part of its revenues.[1] On account of this simoniacal compact on the part of Douglas, and his successor Adamson, but still more from their want of canonical consecration, I have not enrolled them among the pri-

[1] This nobleman, (who had assisted at the murder of Darnley, and would have murdered his own queen, if Elizabeth had bribed him sufficiently—*Tytler*, vol. viii. p. 15,) when he became regent, and supreme temporal head of the Kirk, found out other ways of enriching himself by church plunder. He persuaded the ministers to allow him to draw the thirds of benefices, promising to pay them their salaries more regularly than they had been paid before. But he no sooner got them into his hands, than he set apart a large proportion of them for his own use. Besides this, he, in many instances, joined two and three parishes together, on the plea that not more than one minister, or reader, could be got for them. To this minister or reader, he gave the income of one of the parishes, and kept the rest to himself! It is believed there were more than 2000 parishes in Scotland before the Reformation, which were soon after reduced to less than half that number, by means of these and subsequent junctions. Morton met with a violent death, and left no lawful issue. Appendix LV.

mates of Scotland, though, in other respects, not undeserving of praise for their learning and virtues.

Douglas had been originally a prior of the order of the Carmelites, of which there were several convents in Scotland, though to which of them he belonged does not appear. As early as 1539, he had been made Principal of St Mary's college by the two Beatons, who were its founders, and who must have considered him fitted for that important and responsible office. Some years before the Reformation broke out, Douglas saw and denounced the abuses of the papal system; and, partly with a view to spread the reformed opinions, partly to escape from the vigilance of Archbishop Hamilton, he became chaplain to the old Earl of Argyll, under whose auspices he was encouraged to promote the cause of Reformation, and preached openly against the Romish superstitions both in Edinburgh and Argyllshire. At the same time, he acted as tutor to Lord Lorn, the earl's eldest son, and fitted him for the conspicuous part which, we have seen, he afterwards took in advancing the same cause. While Douglas was in this situation, the primate used his endeavours to persuade the earl to dismiss him from his service, as one who was an avowed enemy to the mother church, undertaking to provide him with another and a better chaplain in his place; but this offer the earl declined, and expressed his determination to support Douglas, which he accordingly continued to do till his own death in 1558. The Principal of St Mary's was now an acknowledged reformer: he openly took part with the Lords of the Congregation, and was one of those appointed to draw up the Confession of Faith in 1560.

It was this individual whom Morton selected to be the first tulchan Archbishop of St Andrews. When he had obtained his agreement to the simoniacal com-

pact already referred to, he got the then Regent Mar to issue a *congé d'élire* to the new Chapter of St Andrews, to elect Douglas for their archbishop. This chapter, by a recent enactment, consisted of the ministers of the parishes which had belonged to the Augustinian Priory.[1] Such was Morton's influence, that they elected the person recommended to them, as a matter of course; and the next step was his inauguration into his office. This was set about in the following manner, which might be called extraordinary, were it not that all Scottish ecclesiastical matters were now conducted in a most extraordinary and unprecedented manner.

There happened to reside at this time in St Andrews, Robert Stewart, brother of the late Regent Lennox, who had been Bishop-elect of Caithness just before the Reformation. He had never been consecrated; but, by his family interest, and by joining the reformers, he had secured the temporalities of his see; and not only so, but he had, moreover, obtained from his brother a gift of the rich priory of St Andrews; both of which pieces of preferment he kept during the remainder of his life.[2] "There is no reason to think," says Keith, "that this person was ever duly, and according to the universal usage of the primitive Catholic times, vested with any sacred character at all; yet it is not a little diverting to observe how the men at the helm of public affairs in those days, granted permission to him to assist at the consecration of other men to the sacred office of bishop. I persuade myself that the preamble to the following commission

[1] By a still later act in 1606, this chapter was reduced to seven ministers of the diocese; and again, in 1617, they were increased to their former number.

[2] The tomb of Stewart is yet to be seen in the old chapel of St Leonard's college, St Andrews. Chap. ix. vol. ii.

will surprise most people: 'Our sovereign lord, with advice, &c., ordains ane letter to be made under the Great Seal, in due form, direct to the reverend father in God, Robert bishop of Caithness, and the Superintendants within this realm, commanding them to consecrat the said Mr John Douglas, electit as said is, a bishop of the metropolitan kirk of St Andrews,' &c., and investing him with 'all and hail the benefice of St Andrews, as well temporality as spirituality.'" To Stewart were joined Wynram,[1] Spotswood, Lindsay, and one or two others, who, being at most in priests' orders, could have no spiritual authority either to ordain or consecrate. Knox was also at St Andrews on this occasion; but he refused to take any part in the election of Douglas, though requested to do so by Lord Morton himself, who was also present; not, however, from any doubt of his own powers, but either because he thought the duty would more properly be performed by superintendants, or because he knew Douglas had consented to alienate a large portion of his ecclesiastical income in favour of his patron. He preached a sermon, indeed, on the occasion; but, in the course of it, he was bold enough to pronounce an anathema both on him who gave, and him who received the archbishopric, under such objectionable circumstances. Douglas also delivered a sermon, by way of giving a specimen of his doctrine. He was then formally elected by those present, under a protest, however, from Mr Scott the minister of Kirkcaldy. On the day of his instalment, Wynram went up into the pulpit of the parish church, the archbishop-elect being placed in a chair before him. At his side sat Stewart, Spotswood, and Lindsay. The preacher delivered a sermon from Titus ii. 1, after which he asked

[1] Wynram's tomb is in the same chapel near Stewart's.

Douglas, "Wilt thou be obedient unto the Church, and usurp no power over the same?" To which the latter answered, "I will claim no power over the same, but what the Council and General Assembly shall prescribe." At the conclusion of the ceremony, the abovementioned individuals rose up, *laid their hands on the archbishop*, and embraced him, as a sign of his induction and admission.

The titular prelate held his situation for four years, till his death in 1576, during which period I have not been able to collect many particulars concerning him.[1] Richard Ballantyne or Ballenden, (the secretary of Knox,) in his "Memorials,"[2] says of him, that "he was still permitted to retain his former offices of Principal of St Mary's college and Rector of the University," on which he makes this remark:—"Here we may see what corruption the Kirk has come unto now, that puts more upon the back of ane old man than ten persons are able to bear." Douglas was guilty of some ecclesiastical irregularities and remissness of discipline, and neglected to preach as often as the General Assembly thought he should have done; "so that, through his fault, the *exercise* of St Andrews was like to decay."[3] This "exercise" was a periodical meeting of the ministers and elders of a given district, for the infliction of discipline on delinquents; and out of these meetings are supposed to have arisen the presbyteries, which were as yet unknown in Scotland. In April 1573, Douglas was one of the representatives in parliament of the spiritual state; but in the General Assembly held in Edinburgh the same year, he

[1] On the cast of his seal which I possess, St Andrew is represented holding his cross; the motto is illegible, but the legend is, "Sigillum rotundum R. D. Johannis archiepiscopi Sancti Andreæ, 1571."

[2] Recently printed by the Bannatyne Club.

[3] Book of the Universall Kirk, pp. 255, 269, 291.

was treated in the same humiliating manner that the superintendants had been before him. He was accused of not preaching and visiting during the preceding half-year, or of visiting by proxy instead of personally. His answer was, that he always preached personally when he did visit; but because of sickness, he had not been able to leave his home since the last Assembly. He was accused of some other things, which he either denied, or pleaded as his excuse, ignorance or infirmity. In March 1574, he attended the Assembly at Edinburgh, in a very debilitated state. Being charged with still retaining the rectory of the university and the principalship of his college, he answered that he was content to demit both offices as soon as the Regent Morton should direct him; thus acknowledging that sacrilegious regicide as the head both of the Kirk and of the Assembly. Being asked why he had neither visited Fife nor preached in St Andrews, he pleaded his ill state of health, adding, "since I took the bishopric I have never been *well disposed*." He meant in respect to his corporeal strength; but his words excited a sarcastic smile on the countenances of many of the reverend members of the Assembly, who chose to understand them in a moral sense. But what an anomalous state of things was this! An unconsecrated bishop of a reformed church, at the bar of unordained preachers and elders, the object alike of their censure and their derision! What would the apostolic fathers, or indeed any portion of the Church Catholic for fifteen hundred years after its foundation, have thought of such a scene? Latterly, poor old Douglas was unable, or scarcely able, to preach. For this he was so severely taunted, (for an "unpreaching prelate" was then deemed an abomination,) that he determined to make one last effort. He entered the pulpit of the parish church, and after

exerting himself as he best could, his strength wholly failed him,—he sunk down, and died on the spot![1] He was buried in the public cemetery, without any monument.[2]

Before we proceed to the next tulchan episcopate, we must return and see what passed at St Andrews during Knox's abode there, at the time of Douglas's installation. James Melville, in his "Diary," informs us that he often heard the Reformer preach at this time. "I saw him," he says, "every day of his doctrine, go hulie and fear [slowly and cautiously] with a furring of martricks [martens] about his neck, a staff in one hand, and good godly Richard Ballenden, his servant, holding up the other shoulder, from the abbey to the parish kirk; and by the said Richard and another servant, lifted up to the pulpit, where he behoved to lean at his first entry; but before he had done with his sermon, he was sa active and vigorous that he seemed *as if he would ding the pulpit in blads, and flee out of it.*"

But however vigorously Knox preached at this his last visit to St Andrews, he was far from finding his residence there agreeable. Queen Mary's party, to which he was keenly opposed, prevailed in the university, especially in St Mary's and St Salvator's colleges. Among her adherents were Robert Hamilton, minister of the parish church, who had succeeded Goodman; Archibald Hamilton his brother, a professor in St Mary's; and John Rutherford, provost of St Salva-

[1] I have given this anecdote on the authority of the Rev. J. Scott, minister of Perth, in his "History of the Lives of the Scottish Reformers," p. 215. I have never found it in any other writer; but I understand it is mentioned in a scurrilous book called "Naphtali;" and quoted as an instance of divine judgment on Douglas for becoming a bishop!

[2] In publico cemeterio sub cospete sine ulla inscriptione vel monumento.—Mr Pringle's MS. book in the university.

tor's. These men had at one time been stanch adherents of Knox; but partly from their becoming connected with the queen's friends, and partly from their taking umbrage at Knox's personally vilifying them for so doing, they were now his declared opponents; and this gave rise to scandalous reports, pulpit recriminations, and personal altercations between them. All this, it may easily be conceived, rendered Knox's stay among them very unpleasant; for he candidly acknowledged, that whenever he saw, or thought he saw, anything deserving of censure in the conduct of public men, he could not forbear denouncing them from the pulpit, in no measured or ambiguous language. Nay, he declared that on such occasions "he was not master of himself, but must obey *Him* who commanded him to speak plain,"—a persuasion which, in an uninspired teacher, could not only not be founded on good grounds, but liable to be attended with the most mischievous consequences. These opponents of the Reformer, says Dr M'Crie, "were thorns in his side, as long as he resided among them." But in the college of St Leonard's he found the professors to be of his own views, and with them he exclusively connected himself.

His parishioners in Edinburgh now applied to him to return among them, the more so, as they were displeased with the conduct of his colleague, Mr Craig. He consented to return, but only on the condition, that he was to be at liberty to denounce from the pulpit, in what language he pleased, the Marian party, which had got possession of the castle of Edinburgh, and was using every endeavour to strengthen its influence. His parishioners answered, that "they never meant to put a bridle on his tongue; but desired he would speak according to his conscience, as in former times." Accordingly, he finally quitted St Andrews

in August 1572, and returned to Edinburgh, where he died in the November following.[1]

Before we dismiss the episcopate of Douglas, it will be proper to state that, at the commencement of it, an unfortunate woman who passed for a *witch* was burnt in St Andrews. The following account of this inhuman transaction is extracted from Bannatyne's "Memorials," to which I have already referred. "The 28th of Aprile (1572) thare was ane wretch brunt in St Androis, who was accused of many horrible thingis, which sho denied, albeit thei were sufficientlie proven. Being desired that sho wold forgive a man that had done her some offence, as sho alleged, refused. When ane uther that stude by, said, gif sho did not forgive, God wold not forgive her, and so sho suld be damned; but sho, not caring for heaven or hell, said openly, 'I pass not whidder I goe to hell or to heaven,' with divers utheris execrable wordis. Efter her hands were bound, the provist causeth lift up her cloathes, to see her mark that sho had, or to see gif sho had anything upon her, I cannot weil tell; but there was a white cloath lyke a colar-craige with stringis in betweine her legs, whareon was mony knottis upon the stringis of the said colar-craige, which was taken from her, sore against her will; for belike, sho thought that sho could nought have died, that being upon her; for, said sho, when it was taken from her, 'now I have no hoip of myself.'"[2]

It is painful to add that Knox was concerned in this cruel and disgusting business, or at least in some other of a like nature. J. Melville, in his "Diary,"

[1] "The same day (24th) John Knox, minister, decessit in Edinburgh, quha, as was allegit, haid the maist pairt of the wyt [blame] of all the cummeris [troubles] in Scotland, sen the slaughter of umquhile the cardinal." Diurnal of Occurrents, p. 320. He was buried in the churchyard of St Giles, which is now a paved street.

[2] Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 233.

p. 46, speaking of an execution at Stirling, adds, "It was the first execution that ever I saw, except of a witch at St Androis, against the quhilk Mr Knox delt from the pulpit, sche being set up at a pillar before him." When we take into account that both Knox and Melville were in St Andrews at the time the foregoing execution is described by the secretary of the former, who appears himself to have witnessed it, it hardly admits of doubt that it is the same which is alluded to by the author of the "Diary."

After the death of Douglas, the Earl of Morton who was now regent, had to look out for another minister to supply his place; and this he readily found in his own chaplain, Patrick Adamson, whom he put into the metropolitan chair by his own simple mandate, without any consent of the Kirk, or even the formality of inauguration. In the plenitude of his power, he also obliged those ministers who constituted the chapter of the church, to confirm his appointment.[1] This, as may be supposed, gave great offence to Adamson's brethren, and originated the disputes which he had with them for the remainder of his life. It was said of him that, having been anxious to be made archbishop at the former vacancy, and not succeeding in his wish, he sneeringly gave vent to his disappointment in a sermon which he preached at the time, in the parish church of St Andrews, in which he drew a comparison between what he called "my lord bishop," "my lord's bishop," and "the Lord's bishop." The first, he said, was popish or episcopal; the second was the tulchan or nobleman's bishop: but the third and only true one, was the faithful overseer of Christ's flock. But it is not easy to form a correct opinion of him, so opposite are the accounts which are handed

[1] Spotswood, p. 277.

down by contemporary Episcopal and Presbyterian authors. He was, however, universally allowed to be an eloquent preacher; and that he was a man of learning, and an elegant Latin poet, his published writings testify.[1] He had been educated at the university of St Andrews, after which, being in humble circumstances, he became schoolmaster at Ceres in Fife. While there, his talents and superior scholarship attracted the notice of Sir James Makgill of Rankeillour, who made him tutor to his son, and sent him to travel with him on the Continent. With young Makgill he studied law, for nearly three years, at the university of Bruges. While there, he published the tragedy of Herod in Latin verse, and also a Latin translation of the Scottish Confession of Faith, both of which procured him great applause. On returning to his native country, in 1568, or 1569, he married the daughter of an advocate in Edinburgh, and practised for a time as a lawyer; but not succeeding in that profession, he turned his attention to the Kirk, and being found *qualified* according to the loose notions of the time, he was admitted to the ministerial office. When the distinguished George Buchanan in 1570 resigned the principalship of St Leonard's college, St Andrews, he is stated to have done so "in favour of his well-beloved P. Adamson, and no otherwise; of whose honesty, qualifications, literature, and sufficiency to administer the said charge and place, not only the said Mr George, but the lords, nobility, and estates, have good opinion and certain experience." Yet from some unexplained cause, Adamson's name does not appear in the list of principals of that college. In 1573, he became minister of Paisley, and chaplain to the Regent

[1] Translations of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and other books of Scripture, into Latin verse.

Morton; by whom, on the death of Douglas, he was presented to the primacy of Scotland, denuded as it was of nearly all its former rank and riches, and its extensive ecclesiastical jurisdiction; these privileges and emoluments having been transferred, as we have already seen, to Morton himself.

Adamson, soon after his appointment, introduced, in his official capacity of Chancellor of the University, various reforms into its constitution and discipline; and, in particular, the exclusive study of divinity into St Mary's college, instead of philosophy which had been chiefly taught there before, and procured the change to be ratified by parliament; a change which continues in operation to the present day.[1] But the act of his life which involved the most momentous consequences, both to himself and the Church, was his assisting to bring Mr Andrew Melville to St Andrews, and making him principal of St Mary's college, and rector of the university. This well-known personage had been bred at Geneva, in the Calvinistic school, where he had received a strong bias in favour of puritanical democracy, and an equally strong hatred of monarchy and Episcopacy. Being, however, a man of undoubted talent and learning, he had been sent for, some years before this, by the recently-created tulchan Archbishop of Glasgow, to assist him in the government of his university. That connexion was now brought to a close, by an attempt, on the part of Melville, to destroy the noble cathedral of that ancient city, and by a systematic opposition to his patron the archbishop, which terminated in his death from a broken heart. Undeterred by this warning, Adamson was imprudent enough to concur with the General Assembly of the Kirk in bringing him to St Andrews,

[1] Appendix I. *sub anno* 1579.

where, indeed, he had not a cathedral to destroy, as that was already done to his hands, but where he had an archbishop to harass and persecute to death; an object which in the end, as we shall see, he succeeded but too well in effecting.

"Melville was a man," says the learned Sage, "by nature fierce and fiery; confident and peremptory; peevish and ungovernable. Education in him had not sweetened nature, but nature had soured education; and, both conspiring together, had tricked him up into a true original. He hated the crown as much as the mitre; the sceptre as much as the crosier; and would have made as bold with the purple as with the rochet." He and his party were at this time labouring for the introduction of the Genevan polity into Scotland; and we may form some notion of the unscrupulous expedients they resorted to, in order to gain their end, from the fact, that when the Regent Morton asked them what progress they had made in their undertaking, they replied, that "the work was far from being complete; but that, as *God should reveal* farther unto them, they should be willing to help and renew the same."[1] In other words, finding no authority in Scripture or antiquity for their favourite scheme, they pretended to receive it by an express revelation from heaven! "There cannot," says the learned prelate quoted above, "be a greater evidence of the unskilfulness of the clergy of those times in the ancient records of the church, than their suffering Melville and his party to obtrude upon them the 'Second Book of Discipline;' a split-new democratical system, a very farce of novelties, never before heard of in the Christian church." But we shall hear more of this system in the sequel.

[1] Spotswood, p. 277.

Meantime, it will throw light upon the church history of this period, if we state here, that in 1580, a General Assembly of the Kirk which met in Dundee, had declared, at the instigation of Melville, that "the office of a bishop, as it was then used, and commonly taken within the realm, had neither foundation, ground, nor warrant in the Word of God." Nothing could be more true. A tulchan bishop was, indeed, a novelty in the Church Catholic, and had no warrant whatever in Scripture. Whether by this the Assembly meant to deny that Timothy and Titus were, by apostolic authority, ordainers and overseers of presbyters and deacons, (*i. e.* bishops in the modern sense of the word,) was a point on which they, no doubt, thought it prudent to be silent.

Melville arrived at St Andrews in the year 1582: and, a few months after, such was the high opinion then entertained of him by his brother ministers, he was made Moderator of the General Assembly held in this city. Few matters of general interest were brought before it. Mr Robert Kerr master of Requests, was the king's commissioner, who presented a letter from his master, and took a part in the discussions. Sunday markets were very properly forbidden, which appear to have been common at that period. On the other hand, a general fast was enjoined, of a week's continuance, *from Sunday to Sunday inclusive*. Of all Presbyterian customs, few are more to be deprecated than that of making Sunday a fast day: thus turning into mourning a day which, from the apostolic age, was always set apart by Christians as an occasion of rejoicing.[1] But the principal affair which came be-

[1] Bingham's Antiquities, Book xvi. chap. 9. sect. 3. Tertullian says it was counted a crime (*nefas*) to fast on the Lord's day; and so speak all the fathers and early councils. Even in the Lent fast, the Sundays were excepted, as they still are, in the Episcopal church; yet

fore this Assembly, was the acceptance, by Mr Robert Montgomery, of the titular archbishopric of Glasgow. This tulchan prelate had entered into a formal agreement with the Duke of Lennox, (who had had the property of the see assigned to him by the king,) that he would pay the duke all the rents and teinds of the archbishopric, on the condition of receiving to himself "£1000 Scots annually, with some horse-corn and poultry!" One should have thought this simoniacal compact, in a bishop, a very fit subject of inquiry for a church calling itself reformed. Yet the Assembly found no fault with him on this ground, but simply for his acceptance of the episcopal office![1] It is true, they got up a few insignificant charges against him, in order to pacify the king's commissioner who was very angry with them for interfering about the archbishopric; but few of their charges were proved, and they were all fallen from, as soon as Montgomery was induced to confess himself guilty, which he did, of the heinous sin of accepting a prelacy.

The following extract from James Melville's "Diary," will give us some idea of the prejudice existing in the minds of the Presbyterians towards Adamson; their readiness to credit any absurd stories to his disadvantage; and the little justice, consequently, which he had to expect at their hands:[2]—"All this time, since the General Assembly of 1582, until this August (1583,) Bishop Adamson kept his castle, like a tod [fox] in a hole, sick of a disease of great fetidity, and oftentimes under the care of women suspected of witchcraft, especially one who confessed to have learnt medicine of a William Simson, who appeared divers

St Augustine tells us, (tom. ii. p. 59,) that in his time Sunday fasting was practised where we should least have expected it—at Rome!

[1] Spotswood, p. 316. [2] The spelling is modernized.

times to her after his death, and gave her a book.[1] This woman, being examined by the presbytery, and found a witch in their judgment, was given to the bishop to be kept in his castle for execution; but he suffered her to slip away. Notwithstanding, within three or four years after, she was taken and execute in Edinburgh for a witch. It was reported to us as a verity, that the bishop consulted with these witches, as to the king's estate and his own, and got a response that he should stand so long as the king stood. But the devil deceived him there. We were plain and sharp with him as to these witches, both from the pulpit, and in doctrine, and by censure of our presbytery.[2] But notwithstanding the bishop's sickness, when the king came to St Andrews in July,[3] and separated himself from the lords that had seized him at Ruthven, the bishop becomes a whole man all at once, and occupies the pulpit before the king, lustily declaiming against his enemies and all their proceedings. And he that had often professed before that he had not the gift of application, now got this gift by inspiration of such a spirit as never spake in the Scriptures of God. And because it was reported for truth, that the duke [of Lennox] had died a Papist, he made open contradiction thereto, affirming for certain, that he died a good Protestant; which he proved by showing a scroll in his hand which he called the Duke's Testament; but an honest merchant-woman,

[1] "The Archbishop of St Andrews swallowed the prescriptions of this poor hypochondriac, with good faith and will, eating a stewed fowl, and drinking out, at two draughts, a quart of claret, medicated with the drugs she recommended. According to the belief of the time, this Alison Pearson transferred the bishop's indisposition from himself to a white palfrey, which died in consequence."—*Sir Walter Scott's Letters on Demonology.*

[2] This may give us some notion of the kind of subjects which at this time were preached upon, and brought before church courts.

[3] The occurrence here alluded to will be mentioned presently.

sitting before the pulpit, and spying it narrowly, affirmed it was an account of four or five years standing which a few days before she had sent to him."

There is no reason for believing that Andrew Melville had gone through any form of ordination to the office of the priesthood. In this respect, indeed, he was only on a par with the rest of his brethren; and hence we are not to be surprised at finding him taking upon himself the duties of the parish minister of St Andrews. At this time, there happened to be a vacancy in that situation, arising from a cause which affords another of the many examples of the iniquitous application of church property in those *reformed* times —property which had been secured to its legitimate possessors by a hundred charters of successive kings, pontiffs, and prelates, under a solemnly-denounced curse on all who should divert it to any but sacred purposes. Stewart, the Bishop-elect of Caithness, whom we have already mentioned as having assisted at the installation of Archbishop Douglas, had been made commendator of the priory of St Andrews; that is, he had the right given him of disposing of its revenues in any manner he pleased, but on the condition of paying out of them a very moderate stipend to the parish minister of the city. This reasonable condition, however, he had omitted to fulfil; the minister had, in consequence, resigned his office; and hence arose the vacancy which Melville now undertook to supply gratuitously. But we will allow Dr M'Crie, the biographer and eulogist of Melville, to inform us how he performed the pulpit duties of his new charge. "As long as he continued to preach, it was impossible for him to refrain from condemning the conduct of those who had obstructed the settlement of the parish. The umbrage taken at this was increased, by the plainness with which he rebuked the more flagrant vices which

prevailed among the inhabitants, and were overlooked by those in authority. Galled by his reproofs, the provost one day rose from his seat in the middle of his sermon, and left the church, muttering his dissatisfaction with the preacher. Placards were affixed to the new college (St Mary's), threatening to set fire to the principal's lodging, to bastinade him, and chase him out of the town. His friends became alarmed for his safety, but he remained unintimidated, and refused to give place to the violence of his adversaries. He summoned the provost before the presbytery for contempt of divine ordinances. He persevered in his public censures of vice. One of the placards was known, by the French and Italian phrases in it, to be the production of James Learmont, younger of Balcomy. This, Melville produced to the congregation, at the end of a sermon in which he had been uncommonly free and vehement, and described the author of it, *who was sitting before him*, as a Frenchified, Italianized, jolly gentleman, who had polluted many marriage beds, and now boasted that he would pollute the Church of God by bastinading his servants!" It was one of the unhappy characteristics of that age, that the pulpit, instead of being devoted to religious instruction, was often made the vehicle of local controversies and defamatory personalities.

The "Raid of Ruthven" is an event well known in the history of this period. The Earls of Mar, Gowrie, Glencairn, and the Master of Glammis, had seized the person of the young king, and kept him in a sort of captivity for twelve months; being in this supported by the General Assembly of the Kirk, which declared that the above noblemen, for so acting, had done "good and acceptable service to their sovereign and the country;" and not only so, but they ordered that every minister should justify to his congregation

this aggression on their prince, and that a rigid persecution should be instigated against all who presumed to express a different opinion. While the king was residing at his hunting-seat of Falkland, in the summer of 1583, under the surveillance of his noble keepers, a convention was appointed to be held at St Andrews, for the settlement of some political affairs. The king conceived that he saw in this, the means of obtaining his freedom. He therefore, with the help of Sir James Melville, secretly sent letters to the well-affected part of his nobility, to meet him at the above city, on the day appointed, with as many of their followers as they could bring, without subjecting themselves to suspicion. He himself determined to reach the city two or three days earlier, that he might consult with his friends, the archbishop, and Colonel Stewart the governor of the castle, as to the best means of effecting his design. Accordingly he set out on his journey as if he had been going to hawk, having none of the Ruthven faction with him except the Earl of Mar. He arrived at Dairsey, where he met the Earl of March, the Provost of St Andrews, and other friends; "at which meeting," says Sir J. Melville, "his majesty thought himself at liberty, like a bird flown out of a cage, passing his time in hawking by the way, after the said meeting, thinking himself sure enough." In this manner he came to St Andrews, Archbishop Adamson holding the castle in readiness for his sovereign. A proposal of taking a view of the old fortress was acted upon by the king, merely as if it had been an accidental suggestion of the moment which had no deeper motive than curiosity. But he and his retinue had no sooner entered the castle gates, than they were shut and barred by Colonel Stewart, the drawbridges raised, and the gentlemen placed on duty in defence

of the walls.[1] The next day, the nobles of both parties entered the town, the discontented barons in greater number and better supplied with arms than the opposite party, and with the intention, it seemed, again to seize upon his majesty's person. A day of strife and battle appeared to be impending; but the exertions of James's friends, who brought a body of royalists into the castle from the town and neighbourhood, made the malecontent lords unwilling to come to violence. The result was, that the royalists prevailed. The Earl of Gowrie was soon after beheaded; Glencairn and Mar were banished the kingdom; and others concerned in the conspiracy were punished. The members of the General Assembly, among whom was Melville, being called upon to account for the part they had taken in the business, pleaded the privilege of the pulpit as an ample apology for expressing their opinion upon state affairs; and contended, that though they might from thence utter even treason, or what was liable to be construed as such, they were not amenable to the king's privy council, or any secular judge, but must be tried and judged by the Church judicatories, at least in the first instance. When Melville appeared before the king in council, "he was never a whit dashed," says Calderwood, "but told them, in plain terms, that they were too bold to control the ambassadors of a greater than themselves. That ye may see your own weakness and rashness in taking upon you that which ye neither can nor ought to do, (laying down his Hebrew Bible before them,) *there* are my instructions and warrant; see if any of you can control me." Such language from an unin-

[1] Moyse's Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland, p. 79. James passed the first night in the Novum Hospitium of the Priory.—*Sir J. Melville's Memoirs*, p. 285-290.

spired, and even uncommissioned teacher, in justification of an act of rebellion against his lawful prince, was intolerable, and might have justified a much severer punishment than was assigned to him. For his behaviour on this occasion, and for accusing the king of "perverting the laws of God and man," he was commanded to enter into prison in Edinburgh castle; but he thought it more prudent to fly into England. Dr M'Crie has a long, elaborate, but, I think, very unsuccessful attempt to defend his hero from the charge of rebellion in the above-mentioned affair. He remained in England twenty months, after which he was permitted to resume his duties at St Andrews, though his democratical principles continued unabated.

The same year, the king sent Archbishop Adamson as his ambassador to Queen Elizabeth, to inform her of the proceedings in Scotland, and to assure her of his settled purpose of adhering to the Protestant interest. On this occasion, it is stated in his Life by his son, that he preached frequently in the London pulpits of the established church; and, moreover, that he drew after him such a concourse of people by his eloquence, and raised in them so high an opinion of the young king his master, that Queen Elizabeth grew jealous, and forbade him to preach any longer. The English clergy, in permitting him to occupy their pulpits, must either have been less particular than they very properly are now, in accepting the services of unordained men; or, what is more probable, they were ignorant of the real state of the case, and took the canonical consecration of an archbishop of St Andrews as a matter for granted. But however this might be, they departed from the positive injunction of the rubric, in the preface to "the form of making deacons," which declares, that "no man shall be accounted a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon in the united Church of England and Ireland, or

suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination."[1]

Soon after this, Queen Elizabeth sent Sir Edward Wotton to King James, in order to contract a league with him, offensive and defensive, against all such Roman Catholic States as might be found to seek the overthrow of the reformed religion. A convention of the three Estates of the realm was immediately summoned to meet at St Andrews, for the purpose of expressing their cordial approbation of this proposal, and their determination to support it. The king opened the meeting with a speech, the substance of which being embodied in a declaration, was signed first by the titular Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow, the Bishop of Dunblane, and seven lay commendators of abbeys, as representatives of the spiritual state, which was still kept up in form at least, however much it had lost of its former dignity and importance; then

[1] Adamson's intercourse with the English bishops on this occasion, and his anxiety to obtain their support, led him to draw up and publish a declaration against Scottish Presbyterianism, which seems to have produced a great sensation. It is said to be in Thinn's Continuation of Hollinshed's History of Scotland. I have never seen it; but Calderwood felt its force so acutely, that he devotes eleven folio pages of his history (171-181) in reply to it: in the course of which he indulges in very coarse invective, and calls his opponent a "holliglass drunkard, and vile epicurean." When an antagonist is foiled in argument, he generally has recourse to hard names. James Melville also says, that Adamson, while in England, "left no stone unturned that he might work the work of *Satan*."—*Diary*, p. 101. The students of St Andrews seem to have viewed the matter in the same light; for when the archbishop returned home, they surrounded his palace, armed with harquebusses, bidding him remember how fatal that see had been to his predecessor, and look for no better treatment. —*Tytler*, viii. 235. It is a remarkable fact, that during the Grand Rebellion, the English sectaries reprinted Adamson's tract, with a view to disparage Presbyterianism, and so pave the way for Independency. And what is equally remarkable, they published it in the archbishop's old Scotch, and annexed a translation into the vernacular English of the period.—*M'Cric's Miscell. Writings*, p. 399.

by six earls and six barons, on behalf of the nobility; and lastly, by numerous commissioners of burghs, on the part of the commonalty.[1]

In the year 1585, three envoys, with a suite of eighty persons, from the King of Denmark, arrived at Leith. They had an interview with the king at Dunfermline, and afterwards proceeded to St Andrews, where they remained till they reëmbarked. They came avowedly for the purpose of demanding the restoration of the Orkney Islands to their sovereign, on the score of some ancient treaty, or to claim the sum of 50,000 florins in their stead; there being a secret intimation, as was alleged, that James might secure the islands for ever, by marrying one of the Princesses of Denmark. This negotiation led, in the end, to the said marriage; but at first, James received the envoys ungraciously; and the populace of St Andrews, having taken some umbrage at them, treated them very uncourteously. This ill understanding was secretly promoted by Wotton the English ambassador, who, like all the rest of Elizabeth's emissaries in Scotland, was ever on the watch to foment discord. But, by the intervention of Sir James Melville, the king was brought to think more favourably of the Danish envoys and their proposals; he promised to renew his treaty with their master in the following year; and sent them on board their ships, well pleased with his hospitality and his presents.

The next year, Andrew Melville, and his nephew James who was one of the ministers of Fife, with a view to follow up their persecution of Adamson, entered into a combination to excommunicate him, for having obtruded himself into the archbishopric, without the sanction of the Kirk, notwithstanding he had

[1] Spotswood, p. 340.

received his majesty's confirmation to that appointment.[1] James Melville preached at the opening of the Provincial Synod which met at St Andrews in the month of April, and of which James Wilkie,[2] principal of St Leonard's college, was president. "The archbishop sat by," says Melville in his Diary, "with a great pontificality and big countenance." He then proceeds to say how ably "he refuted the human and *devilish* bishopric," and demonstrated the general doctrine that the ambition of the chief rulers in the Kirk had ever brought into it all kinds of corruptions; "and lastly," he says, "coming in particular to our own Kirk of Scotland, I turned to the bishop, sitting at my elbow, and directing my speech to him personally, I recounted to him shortly his life, actions, and proceedings against the Kirk; taking the assembly to witness, and his own conscience before God, if he was not an evident proof and example of that doctrine; whom, being a minister of the Kirk, the dragon had so stung with the poison and venom of avarice and ambition, that, swelling exorbitantly out of measure, he threatened the wreck and destruction of the whole body, if he were not timeously and courageously cut off. This particular being confirmed and cleared, exhortation was directed to the assembly to play the chirurgeon, for preserving of the body, seeing all means of amendment had been long since used upon that most corrupt and monstrous member; and this was done with such power of the Spirit and force of utterance as it pleased God to furnish for the work he had in hand." What are we to think of men who can ascribe their own vindictive humour and sectarian partisanship to a

[1] Calderwood, p. 161.

[2] Wilkie's tombstone is still to be seen on the floor of St Leonard's chapel, immediately under the mural monument of Robert Stewart bishop-elect of Caithness.

divine influence? According to this writer's testimony, the unhappy bishop, after the foregoing rebuke, was "so dashed and struck with terror, that he could scarcely sit, and still less stand upon his feet." But not to dwell upon these details, let it be sufficient to say, that Adamson at first refused to answer to the above accusations, alleging it was rather his prerogative to judge his accusers than theirs to judge him. But after being repeatedly summoned, he gave in objections to their procedure, and, at the same time, answers to the charges brought against him. He objected, among other things, that the two Melvilles, and the Master of Lindsay who was their coadjutor, were his personal enemies, and ought not, therefore, to be permitted to sit as his judges; but the Synod allowed them to retain their seats, after they had cleared themselves of malice in the customary way. This brought on an altercation between James Melville and the archbishop, in the course of which the former called the latter an unclean beast, a monster, a liar, and a blasphemer, and, among other opprobrious epithets, "an asserter of liberty of conscience."[1] A majority of two only voted for the archbishop's excommunication, which made the Moderator ashamed to pronounce it; "whereupon," says Spotswood, "a young fellow of the name of Hunter, after a number of members had begun to leave the house, willed them to stay, professing that he was *warned by the Spirit* to pronounce the sentence; and so, ascending the chair, he read the same out of the book, a few only remaining as witnesses." This conduct on the part of the Synod, even Dr M'Crie admits, was "precipitate and irregular." The meeting was held in the hall of St Leonard's college, and its disorderly conduct was imitated the next

[1] Calderwood, p. 201-205.

day by the opposite party; "for then," says Spotswood, "a person of the name of Cunningham came to church during divine service, accompanied by two of the archbishop's servants, and, ascending the reader's desk, pronounced sentence of excommunication against Mr Melville himself, and others of the ministers of Fife who had been most violent in the cause." Such were the disgraceful proceedings which arose out of this false position in which the Kirk had placed itself, by the novel and uncanonical nature of its constitution, and the insubordinate behaviour of its ministers.[1] It is right to add, that the General Assembly afterwards absolved Adamson from his excommunication; but under a protest from Andrew Melville, and the abovementioned Hunter, who allowed their vindictive feelings so far to get the better of them as to declare, that "they still held him as one justly delivered to Satan, notwithstanding his absolution."

"This year," says Moyse, in his "Memoirs," "the plague broke out in St Andrews, and continued till *upwards of four thousand people died*, and the place was left almost desolate." This seems a prodigious number, for a town of so limited a population to lose in the course of a few months. James Melville calls this epidemic "a pest which passed through the principal towns, namely, Edinburgh, St Andrews, St Johnston, and Dundee." He adds, that "Dunfermline

[1] Calderwood finishes his account of this affair with an expression of odium against Adamson, which I should blush to repeat, p. 201 of his History. Indeed this reverend gentleman, throughout the whole of his book, so strongly manifests his hatred of the order of bishops, relates so many divine judgments upon them for their supposed offences, and delights so much to tell anecdotes to their discredit, that it is impossible to receive his testimony without the strongest suspicion of dishonesty. See pages 141, 143, 181, 201, 691, 693. I regret to be obliged to add, that the same remark holds true of nearly all the writers of his school. There is surely no need to offend against good manners, in objecting to a system which we disapprove, and still less to indulge in personalities against those who maintain it.

was the only town in Scotland that was free from it." It abated in the winter. "At the entry of the spring, all the towns, *almost desolate before*, were repeopled, and St. Andrews among the rest, to the which Mr Andrew and I returned, and entered into the college about the middle of the month of March."

The execution of the unfortunate Queen of Scots, who had been kept eighteen years in close imprisonment, was now at hand. As soon as James learnt that this sanguinary measure was resolved on, besides sending up a spirited remonstrance to Elizabeth, he called on his clergy to pray publicly for his unhappy mother, after praying for himself, by merely adding these few words:—"The Lord illumine and enlighten her spirit, that she may attain to the knowledge of the truth, for the safety of soul and body; and preserve her from the present peril." This humane order, most of the ministers refused to obey; in which Dr M'Crie thinks "they might be too squeamish." The king enjoined a fast day to be observed on the occasion, and commanded Adamson to officiate at St Giles' church, Edinburgh, and to pray for the queen. But the Presbyterian ministers put into the pulpit a conceited young man of the name of John Cooper; upon seeing whom, the king, who was present, exclaimed, "Master John, that place was designed for another; but since you are there, do your duty, and obey the charge to pray for my mother." Cooper replied that "he would pray no otherwise than as the Spirit of God should direct him;" and, beginning to pray in his own manner, he poured out a shower of nicknames drawn from Scripture, such as Jezebel, Herodias, &c., upon the poor queen, which so irritated James, that he called upon him to stop. To this injunction he paid no attention, till the captain of the guard went up and pulled the intruder from the pulpit; but not

before he had time to knock upon it, and exclaim, "This day shall bear witness against you in the day of the Lord. Woe be to thee, O Edinburgh! for the last of thy plagues shall be the worst." After uttering these words, he passed down from the pulpit, and, *accompanied by all the women who were present*, left the church. Immediately the Archbishop of St Andrews took his place, and preached a sermon concerning the duty of praying for princes, in which he convinced his hearers that the desire of the king to pray for his mother was most praiseworthy and reasonable.[1]

It will be proper to notice here, a visit paid to this city and university, in 1587, by Sieur de Bartas, a French poet whom King James had invited to his dominions. This person was the author of a work entitled "Divine Weeks and Works," which had procured him a high degree of celebrity, having gone through several editions, and been translated into most of the European languages. The king and he arrived together at St Andrews; and the first thing they did was to repair to St Mary's college, for the purpose of hearing a lecture from Andrew Melville, in which the latter took the opportunity of bringing forward some of his favourite dogmas both as to church and state politics, which were far from being relished by his majesty. The two visiters next waited on the archbishop, by appointment, who read to them and their suite a lecture on the same topics, but

[1] Sharpe's edition of Kirkton, p. 12. Dr Cook's History of the Church of Scotland, vol. i. p. 415. Sir W. Scott remarks on this anecdote, that, if we are to believe current tradition, such contests between the pulpit and the throne occurred frequently at this time. It is said, that a young preacher, dilating before James's face on some matter highly offensive to him, the monarch lost all patience, and said aloud, "I tell thee, man, either speak sense or come down;" to which reasonable request the preacher scornfully replied, "I will neither speak sense nor come down."

containing opposite opinions to those inculcated by Melville. Next day, Adamson entertained the royal party at dinner in his castle. Melville meanwhile, anxious to have the last word in the controversy, sent a message to the king, requesting that he would condescend to hear him once more on the subjects in question. James consented; but expressed his expectation that Melville would be moderate in his language, and have some respect to his presence. At the time appointed, the hall was crowded with auditors, among whom was Adamson himself who had obtained leave from the king to rise up and defend his opinions if he judged it necessary. Andrew, however, was more moderate than was anticipated, confining himself rather to an attack upon Popery than Episcopacy. James himself concluded with a speech to the university, in which he exhorted the members to respect and obey the archbishop as their chancellor. Finally, the party partook of a meal in St Mary's college, which James Melville calls their "four hours," and which is still so named by the common people of Scotland, probably from the hour of the day at which it used to be taken. It consisted, says our author, of "wet and dry confections, with all sorts of wine, whereat his majesty *camped* very merrily a good while, and thereafter went to his horse."

But notwithstanding James's anxiety to uphold Adamson and the bishops, the Melvillian party was gradually curtailing their influence, preparing the way for a pure democracy in the church, and setting the civil government at defiance in the prosecution of their favourite schemes. A fresh instance of this soon occurred in regard to the archbishop. The king had given the late Duke of Lennox's daughter in marriage to the Roman Catholic Earl of Huntly, and commanded the archbishop to perform the ceremony. This

gave great offence to the Presbyterians, who objected to the marriage because Huntly had never signed their Confession of Faith! They, therefore, ordered Adamson not to marry the couple till this were done; but he, esteeming the king's command a sufficient warrant, paid no attention to their prohibition. For this act of disobedience, the presbytery of St Andrews cited him to appear at their bar; but, denying their authority, and depending on the royal protection, he refused to submit. They, in consequence, sentenced him to be deprived of all office and function in the church; which sentence the General Assembly not only confirmed, but ordered to be proclaimed from every pulpit in the kingdom! The king was much incensed at this daring encroachment on his prerogative, but dissembled his anger, as his queen was then daily expected from Denmark; by which forbearance he greatly increased the insolence of the party. Dr M'Crie justifies the Presbyterian ministers in thus acting.[1]

The same year, 1587, James was persuaded by the noblemen and Presbyterian ministers who were about his person, to annex to the crown all the diocesan and abbey lands which had not been permanently vested in private families. The ministers thought that, by this means, they could the more easily get rid of Episcopacy, when the lands from which the bishops drew their incomes were withdrawn; and the nobles conceived that they were more likely to get permanent grants of them from the crown direct, than to profit by them as matters then stood. Both parties succeeded in their object, however religion and the king might suffer. James, who was then only twenty-one years old, consented to this measure the more readily, because it promised to yield an ample supply to his

[1] Life of Andrew Melville, vol. i. p. 313.

pecuniary wants; but he deeply repented of it afterwards, when he found it requisite to establish a canonical episcopacy, because he had then to buy back, at great expense, the very lands which he had thoughtlessly and thanklessly lavished among his favourites. Even the Kirk was a loser by the measure; for, though it paved the way for the total abolition of the Episcopacy which then existed, it was found that the barons who had obtained grants of the ecclesiastical lands, either wholly neglected to provide ministers for the churches belonging to them, or reduced their salaries to so miserable a pittance, that they could not live upon them in any tolerable comfort or respectability.[1]

The Earl of Morton having been by this time beheaded, the Duke of Lennox, who was a favourite of the king, obtained the archiepiscopal lands of St Andrews, out of which he agreed to allow Adamson a small salary during his life; an agreement which he did not latterly perform. The same nobleman had previously obtained a gift of the archiepiscopal lands of Glasgow! This was a more intolerable abuse than any that had existed before the Reformation; indeed, ever since that event, sacrilege had become the crying sin of Scotland. Yet it was committed, not only without a remonstrance from the Reformed Kirk, but with its full concurrence: they tolerated sacrilege, in order that they might get rid of what they were pleased to consider the still greater evil of Episcopacy.

Let us here glance, for a moment, at the state of the colleges in St Andrews, as ascertained at a royal visitation made in 1588. One of the commissioners, speaking of the whole of them, recommends to "forbid their quarrelling, and inquire the opinions of the most discreet, what were meetest to be provided

[1] See in Appendix LV. the fate of those who thus sacrilegiously obtained the church lands.

for punishment of the authors thereof; and albeit it be not altogether prohibit that they flyte, [scold,] yet forbid fighting, or bearing of *daggis* or swords, sending of cartels, or setting up of pasquills." In regard to St Salvator's college, "the provost alleged he was subject to no compt, but only to hold the college free; and will give no compt, nor yet show the said contract; albeit many of the masters deny that there was any such contract." "The two extraordinary professors affirm, that by the words of the Reformation, (of 1579,) they are not subject to live *collegialiter*, to eat and lie within the college: the provost affirms the contrary." "The provost, since the Reformation, affirms that he taught twice a-week the Aphorisms of Hippocrates, till October last, since which he had taught nothing: the masters affirm that he never teaches, scarcely once a-month. Mr Wallwood says he teaches the Institutions, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, at eight in the morning: the provost says he neglects often." "There are no inventories perfect; the provost alleging that William Cranstoun has a great part of them, and that the rest were put in a chest under the earth, and long after found by chance; but that the inventories were altogether consumed therein; so that there are very few extant, except such as are registered in the common register of the university, or in the particular register of the college, the inspection whereof is refused by the provost to the remaining masters; whereupon they complain." "There is no perfect compt these nine years bygane." "The provost delivered one rental, and the masters another, and granted that there were sundry prebendaries not contained in either of them." "Mr W. Wallwood, [said] that since our last visitation, he being at his ordinary lesson at eight o'clock in the morning, the provost, accompanied with the whole youth of the

college, came to the school, and commanded him to come down, for he would teach himself at that hour; whereupon great slander followed." "The prebendaries of the college are disposed of to persons not being students, and who make not actual residence: the reason hereof is alleged to be because there is no certain use of the said prebendaries appointed by the act of Reformation."

In St Mary's college "there were no compts perfect, nor copies ready to be shown to the council, because, as the masters alleged, the Œconomus had made none; but he alleged the contrary, and shewed the discharge he had obtained of Mr James Melville and Mr John Robertson, in Mr Andrew Melville's absence; which, they alleged, they were forced to give him, or otherwise the house would have been skaillit," [emptied.] "We found no perfect inventory, nor common books. The excuse was, Mr Andrew's trouble; and that they scarcely understood the contents of their own inventories."

In St Leonard's college, "They complain upon the conservator of the privileges, that he tarries not in the town, nor deputes none to exercise that jurisdiction; seeing they are compelled to plea before the lords, and abstracted from their cures," &c. "What order shall be taken anent the sedition of scholars, when vacance is refused to them, which has occurred in St Leonard's this last senzie?"[1]

There had been several reformations of the colleges since *the* Reformation of 1560; and this was the result of them! In thirty-eight years after, a law had to be made that, in consequence of these disorders, "the wills of the first founders should take effect and be maintained, except where the same is repugnant to the true religion presently professed within this realm."[2]

[1] Printed "Evidence," p. 193-196. [2] Appendix I., *sub anno* 1621.

The General Assembly met in June 1590. James Melville particularly directed his invectives against Archbishop Adamson, whom he denounced as "impoisoned with the venom of the old serpent; a cockatrice egg, full of falsehood, malice, and knavery;" and finally exhorted "the brethren to ratify and approve the sentence of excommunication justly pronounced against him;" forewarning them of the consequences if they did not.[1]

The next year, a minister was required for the parish of Leuchars, in this neighbourhood. The two candidates were a Mr P. Wemyss and a Mr Robert Wallace; the latter a turbulent man, of whom we shall hear more in the next chapter. Melville sided with his friend Wallace; but the other candidate had a large majority of votes in his favour. Under ordinary circumstances, this would have settled the contest; but Melville, and the party that acted with him, were not thus to be put down. They insisted that Wallace was the *fitter* man of the two, and that his votes, though fewer in number, were more *weighty* than those of his opponent! Each party appeared at the parish church on the following Sunday, and each inducted its own minister, amidst great tumult and confusion. The matter was obliged to be referred to the Synod of Fife, which appointed a committee to examine into the case, and decide upon its merits. One of this committee was Spotswood the historian, who was at that time minister of Calder. When the Melvillian party found they would not get Wallace confirmed in the parish, they found means to cause the other candidate to be set aside also; in consequence of which a new minister was appointed. Spotswood concludes his account of this affair with the following

[1] Calderwood, p. 256.

just remark: "that of all men, none could worse endure *parity*, and loved more to command, than they who had introduced it into the church!" He might have added, that it is the desire of commanding others which makes some men impatient of being themselves commanded. In order to escape from the control of their superiors, their first step is to introduce parity among the members of the community: and, when once they have accomplished that object, they next endeavour, by party spirit and ambition, to acquire a real, though not a nominal authority over their equals. In fact, it is quite evident that the very principle of parity, and disbelief of a divinely-appointed hierarchy, generates, at all times, an arrogance and impatience of control, very inconsistent, to say the least, with the character of the Christian. In such men, we, no doubt, witness zeal, but it is untempered with humility; and religion, but destitute of meekness and forbearance. We see a leaning to their own understanding, a disregard for authority, disaffection to civil government, and even a defiance of their lawful superiors, whenever they happen to differ from themselves; all which is most unfavourable to the growth of "the peaceable fruits of righteousness," and in particular, to that dutiful obedience, and calm endurance of suffering for conscience' sake, which is, or should be, characteristic of the followers of Christ.

Towards the close of his life, Adamson fell into various misfortunes. He began to sink under an incurable distemper: and he was most iniquitously deprived of the small pension which the Duke of Lennox had engaged to pay him out of the revenues of the archbishopric. When in this unhappy condition, he published the Lamentations of Jeremiah in Latin verse, and dedicated the work to the king, in the hope of attracting his attention and sympathy; but it pro-

cured him no favour. He also composed the following verses on his death-bed, which, while they give a favourable specimen of his poetical talents, show also the hopes by which he was supported under the misfortunes that oppressed him.

O anima! assiduis vitæ jactata procellis,
Exilii pertœsa gravis; nunc lubrica, tempus
Regna tibi, et mundi invisas contemnere sordes,
Quippe parens rerum, cæco te corpore clemens
Evocat; et verbi crucifixi gratia, cœli
Pandit iter, patrioque beatam limine sistet.
Progenies Jovæ, quo te cœlestis origo
Invitat, felix perge, æternumque quiesce.
Exuviæ carnis, cognato in pulvere vocem
Angelicam expectent, sonitu quo putre cadaver
Exiliet redivivum, et totum me tibi reddet.
Ecce beata dies! nos agni dextera ligno
Fulgentes crucis, et radiantes sanguine vivo
Excipiet. Quam firma illic, quam certa capesses
Gaudia, felices inter novus incola cives!
Alme Deus, Deus alme, et non effabile nomen,
Ad te unum et trinum, moribundo pectore anhelo.

To heighten his troubles, his religious antagonists now began to insult over him. One Sempell published a "legend of his life," which even a modern Presbyterian writer[1] calls "a most gross and illiberal attack upon the character of Dr P. Adamson, a prelate of ingenuity and erudition, who has often been scandalously traduced." To add to his humiliation, he was under the necessity of asking and accepting pecuniary aid from Andrew Melville, the very person who had been the chief means of reducing him to his present deplorable condition; for his great fault seems to have been, a thoughtless extravagance in his manner of living, which often led him into pecuniary difficulties, and afforded his enemies too good a ground of accusation against him. And as if these calamities were not enough, Melville laboured to assure him

[1] Dr Irving, in his Life of Buchanan.

that his troubles were a just judgment of heaven upon him for his acceptance of the episcopal office; and even when he was in his last moments, prevailed on him to sign a renunciation of his former opinions on the subject of Church government, which he took care to publish under the title of "Mr P. Adamson's recantation;" though it was well known that he was too ill at the time to understand the nature of the document he had subscribed. He died soon after, in the beginning of the year 1592, abandoned both by the king and the Presbyterians, having witnessed his Church polity completely superseded by the Genevan system which Melville had long been labouring to introduce, and had at length succeeded in establishing. All that now remained of the former Episcopacy was, that such of the titular bishops as still existed, were required by the king to retain their seats in parliament, as one of the three ancient estates of the realm; but in the time of the grand rebellion, even this poor privilege was withdrawn by a General Assembly, and declared to be "an antichristian usurpation."[1]

But though Melville had succeeded in his endeavours, it was far from being in concurrence with such of the original reformers as were yet alive. Erskine of Dun opposed the introduction of the new system into his district of Angus; asserting, that "to take away the office of a bishop, were to alter and abolish the

[1] Spotswood says, that Adamson left behind him "Prelections on the two Epistles to Timothy," which, falling into the hands of his enemies, were suppressed, p. 385. It is curious to observe how a Roman Catholic writer speaks of Adamson: "He was one of those heretics who, under the name of archbishop, deformed the church of St Andrews, yet, a most learned man, and an admirable Greek and Latin scholar. He died in poverty, I hear, because he was thought by the ministers of Satan, to be more inclined to the Catholic faith than was becoming."—*Dempster*. Adamson was buried in the public cemetery of St Andrews, without any monumental inscription, as was his predecessor, Douglas.—*Mr Pringle's MS. book*, p. 253.

order which God had appointed in His church." And Spotswood, the superintendent of Lothian, declared that, "the hot-headed ministry, if not checked in time, would ruin all: and that though he had nothing to object to the *doctrine* of the Reformation, yet he believed the *government* of the ancient church preferable to that now introduced." These, and other divines of the same school, made a vigorous, though ineffectual stand against the system of *parity*, and withdrew not their opposition till they were hooted by the mob, and compelled to leave the General Assembly![1] What a lesson! The very men who, thirty years before, had led the people of Scotland along with them in the cause of Reformation, were now insulted, and driven from the Assembly which they had themselves created! Thus it always is with rash reformers. The first set are put aside as insufficient, by a second who, in their turn, are forced to give way to a third; and in this manner, they usually run the round of the circle, till they come back to the point from which they started. It is a fact not very favourable to the doctrine, that "the *people* are the source of all legitimate power," that they never continue long of the same mind; for that cannot be a proper source of power which is fickle and inconstant. It is a doctrine, of the results of which we never can be certain; on which account alone, independent of more weighty considerations, it cannot be a safe principle of action. Dr M'Crie's way of accounting for Erskine's opposition to the Melvillian system is ingenious: "If at a later period, he suffered himself to be entangled by the politics of the court, and lent the influence of his name to measures injurious to the Church, his advanced age, and the difficulty of the times, may be pleaded as an ex-

[1] See Bishop Russell's History of the Church in Scotland, vol. ii. p. 4.

tenuation of his fault." The plain truth is, that Erskine remained true to his original reform principles, such as they were, and Melville had departed from them. But what else, except change, could be expected from a reform hastily undertaken, and still more hastily executed? Already three important alterations had occurred during the few years which had elapsed since the era of the Reformation, namely, the system of Superintendency—that of tulchan Episcopacy—and now that of Melvillian Presbyterianism; which last, we shall soon see, was destined to give way to still more decisive changes.

I will finish this chapter with the opinion of the Melvillian system, given by Dr Cook, by far the most candid of Presbyterian historians: "The ecclesiastical polity introduced by Melville, exerted in Scotland the malignant influence which might have been anticipated from it; extinguished the feelings, and hardened the hearts of those who gloried in supporting it; spread all the rancour of exasperated bigotry throughout the community; and gave rise to scenes of intolerance and persecution, from which every humane and Christian spirit must shrink with the strongest disapprobation." The truth of this will abundantly appear in the next chapter.

CHAP. XIII.

History of St Andrews, from the first establishment of Presbyterianism in 1592, *till the restoration of a Canonical Episcopacy in* 1610.

THE leaders of the new ecclesiastical establishment, being determined to depart as widely as possible from

the practice of the Church Catholic for the preceding 1500 years, appointed a new set of functionaries for its government. "Ministers, Exhorters, and Readers," as we have seen, had been nominated by Knox, as the fittest persons he was able to select for supplying the spiritual wants of the people; but these two last were now set aside, and declared to be "no ordinary officers in the Kirk of God;" and in place of the Knoxian priesthood, these *four* orders were substituted:—first, the *pastor*, whose business it was to preach and dispense the sacraments, marry, and superintend the congregation generally; second, the *doctor*, who was to explain texts of Scripture, but not to apply them; third, the *presbyter* or *elder*, who was to assist pastors in their ministerial duties; and fourth, the *deacon*, who was to have charge of the pecuniary affairs of the congregation. And to prevent, if possible, any more fluctuations, of which there had already been too many, it was declared that these four offices "ought to continue *perpetually* in the Church, as *necessary* for the government and polity of the same; and no more offices ought to be received or suffered in the true Church of God, established by His word."[1] They little foresaw that within fourteen short years from this time, this "perpetual and necessary" polity would be set aside; and that, even when Presbyterianism came to be a second time established by law, two of the above orders would be dropped as superfluous—so changeable and unsettled do men become when once they depart from the practice of the Apostles and the primitive ages!

The "imposition of the hands of the eldership," was now also admitted for the first time since the Reformation; but it is easy to conceive, that they who had

[1] Second Book of Discipline.

never themselves received any ordination, could not be in a very fit state to impart it;[1] even admitting that *true* presbyters had been competent to ordain, which they were not, and still less were *nominal* ones. Indeed it is surprising that they consented to adopt the empty form, considering their well-known sentiments on the subject. But this was said to be done to please the king, who conceived that this mode of inducting ministers into their charges would give additional solemnity to the proceeding. In fact, they meant no more by it than this themselves; for at a Synod of

[1] The Rev. Mr C——, a Scots minister in London, who has acquired some reputation by his writings, has the following extraordinary passage in his "Apology for the Church of Scotland":—"Knox, Winram, Spotswood, P. Hamilton, Andrew Melville, Rillock [Willock,] and Wishart, were, most of them, converted presbyters of the Church of Rome, and others of them ordained by imposition of their hands. These priests, brought to the knowledge of the truth, formed themselves into regularly constituted presbyteries; *and from them have descended, in ministerial succession, all the presbyteries of the Scottish Church.*" I will venture to say, that when Mr C. penned these words, he felt that he was making a leap in the dark, and knew nothing of the subject he was writing about. Let us unravel this thread of names. P. Hamilton was burnt in 1527, at the age of twenty-three, and certainly never transmitted ordination to any one. Wishart, who is supposed to have been a layman, was burnt in 1546, and held that all Christian men and women are "priests unto God." He was not, therefore, very likely to ordain any one; nor is there any account of his having done so. Besides, what evidence have we that either Hamilton or Wishart were Presbyterians? Again, Andrew Melville probably neither *was* ordained, nor *did* ordain; for his nephew, James Melville, who was the echo of all his opinions, (and was himself the unordained minister of Anstruther and Kilrenny,) in his Diary, calls the distinction between the clergy and laity, "the pride of papistrie, and arrogancie of the shavelings."—*M'Crie's Life of Melville*, vol. i. p. 271. As to the remaining four, they had probably been Roman Catholic priests: but their ordination died with them; for not only did they never ordain any persons, as Mr C. asserts, but they abolished ordination altogether as a useless ceremony, as I have shown p. 313; nor was there any "regularly constituted presbytery," in Scotland, "by imposition of hands," till all the four above-mentioned priests were dead; that is, not till upwards of thirty years after the Reformation. So that Mr C.'s notion of a "ministerial succession, through regular presbyteries," is as baseless as the superstructure which human device has erected upon it.

Fife, in 1597, the following question and answer are recorded:—"*Q.* Is he a lawful pastor who wanteth imposition of hands? *A.* Imposition, or laying on of hands, is not essential or necessary, but ceremonial and indifferent, in admission of a pastor." This decision, it must be allowed, was in perfect keeping with all their other proceedings. With respect to the headship of the new establishment, though it is difficult to conceive any visible body without a visible head, yet, as the favourite doctrine of parity naturally rendered all personal control unpalatable, the ministers resolved to yield subjection to none but an invisible head. And to make up for the defect arising from the absence of miraculous intercourse between them and their head, the *civil magistrate* was armed with extensive powers, being bound to "make laws and constitutions for the advancement of the Kirk, according to God's word;" and when he was in any doubt as to the meaning of "God's word," he was "*to hear and obey the voice of the ministers*, and reverence the majesty of God *by them speaking!*"[1] Here was a distinct claim to infallibility, which, it must be confessed, harmonized very well with the pretence that the new polity had been *revealed* to its originators.[2] The plain meaning was, that whatever party had the ascendancy in the General Assembly, which the framers of these laws knew very well was at that

[1] Spotswood, p. 289-298. The existing establishment of Scotland boasts that she has no head but Jesus Christ, and taunts the Church of England with having the sovereign for her head. This is altogether a misconception. Jesus Christ (with reverence be it said) is as much the Head of the one church as he is of the other, *assuming* that he acknowledges himself the head of any religious community which has twice scornfully rejected an Apostolical Episcopacy, after being twice solemnly conferred upon it. Our 37th Article justly explains the ecclesiastical power vested in the sovereign, in England and "other his dominions," Scotland included. The act of Henry VIII., which declared him "head of the Church," was repealed by Queen Mary, and was never renewed by her successors.

[2] See p. 392.

time their own, they were to oblige the executive government, if they could, to act according to their dictates, and thus to tyrannize at pleasure over the civil and religious liberties of the people. This was no great step gained after thirty-two years of reformation.

The period which witnessed the triumph of the Melvillian system, was one of so much turbulence and disorder, that it speedily worked out its own destruction. I will here put down chronologically those events connected with St Andrews, which occurred during the period in question:—

1592. The following is an extract from Mr J. Melville's Diary, the narrative, however, being somewhat abbreviated, and the spelling modernized. "In that summer, the devil stirred up a most dangerous tumult of the people of St Andrews, against my uncle, [A. Melville,] to the extreme peril of his life, if God had not been his protection. The wicked malicious rulers of the town hated Mr Andrew, because he could not bear with their ungodly and unjust dealing; and they incensed the rascally mob by false information against him and his college, making them believe that he and the college sought the trouble of the town. They being thus prepared, the devil furnishes them with an opportunity of falling to work. There were some students of theology, who, wearying to go out of the college to their exercise, erected a large pair of butts in the college garden adjoining to a wynd of the town. At this they were shooting one afternoon, when one of them, (Mr John Caldcleuche, a master of theology, but scarcely a scholar in archery,) missing the butt, and some thatched houses beyond, shot his arrow down the wynd, and hit an old honest maltman of the town, and hurt him on the neck. This coming to the ears of the foresaid malicious rulers, they rung the common bell, and stirred up the mob, who attacked

the college, broke open the gate, and, with great violence, tried to force an entrance into the hall, crying for fire to burn it. But the Lord, assisting his servant with wisdom and courage, enabled him to deal mildly with some of them, whom he knew to be misled, and sharply with others, whom he knew to be deceivers of the people. By the exertions of Mr David Black, and Mr Robert Wilkie principal of St Leonard's, with other masters and scholars of the university, after long vexation and much ado, the uproar was quelled," p. 206. It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader, that both the Melvilles were keen party men, and that they made no scruple of ascribing to the devil whatever was contrary to their own preconceived notions of propriety. Indeed, nothing is more remarkable, throughout J. Melville's Diary, than his peremptory decisions as to the causes of the calamities which befall particular persons. If the person be a friend, the calamity is a trial of his patience; if an enemy, it is a judgment for his sins. He makes every dispensation of providence fall in with his own preconceived opinions of men and things.

1593. The Synod of Fife met in July this year at St Andrews, and summoned before it the Popish Lords, Huntly, Angus, Errol, and Home, together with Sir J. Chisholm. On their non-appearance, they excommunicated them, as being guilty of "idolatry, blasphemies, apostacy, professed enmity against the Kirk, &c.;" "In the name and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, they did cut off the said persons from their communion, and delivered them to Satan to the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit may be safe, if so it please God to reclaim them by true repentance, otherwise, to their just everlasting condemnation; and ordaineth intimation to be made thereof by every one of the pastors in their kirks

immediately; with interdiction that none presume to receive them within their houses, or have any dealing, fellowship, or society with the said excommunicate persons; with certification that the contraveners shall incur the like censure, sentence, and judgment."[1] This sentence was promulgated and acted upon throughout all the presbyteries. When the king showed some disposition to secure the earls from this severe and arbitrary proceeding, commissioners of the General Assembly were sent to him with a petition in which, after denouncing the earls as "excommunicate and treasonable apostates," they pray that "they may be kept in sure custody;" that "the assizes be not nominate by the appointment of the parties to be accused, but by the party accusants, namely, the whole professors of the Gospel;" and that "they be not admitted to have any person in judgment, nor any benefit of law, till they be joined unto Christ, and reconciled unto His Kirk,"—"for certainly," they add, "we are determined that the country shall not brook us and them both, so long as they are God's professed enemies."[2] A more intolerant and anti-Christian spirit than this had never been exhibited by the Romanists themselves in the plenitude of their power; and this was an illustration of that part of the new polity which directed the civil magistrate "to hear and obey the voice of God speaking through his ministers"! Long and complicated proceedings followed upon this petition to the king, which, as they have no concern with St Andrews, I will not enter upon. I may only observe, that Huntly, Angus, and Errol were banished to the Continent; but, in the year 1596, on consenting to conform to the Kirk, were absolved and permitted to return home again. How-

[1] Calderwood, p. 291.

[2] Rymer, vol. xvi. p. 222.

ever, like all unwilling confessors, they took the first opportunity of relapsing to their former faith; on which the General Assembly supplicated his majesty, that "the laws against Papists should be put in full execution; that the sons of Popish noblemen should be brought up by Protestants, and that excommunicated Papists should be imprisoned, and none have access to them but such as are known to be of good religion." What would our jealous and intolerant forefathers of that age say, could they be now told, that not only are Roman Catholics protected in the exercise of their religion, and even many of their colleges and clergy paid by our Protestant government, but that the members of that communion are admitted into the British parliament, to legislate for the Protestant churches established by law, in matters intimately connected with their legal existence? Incidit in Scyllam qui vult evitare Charibdim.

To do Melville justice, he was not wanting in presence of mind or personal courage, of which he gave an example this year. I am again indebted to his nephew's "Diary." "On Michaelmas day, the crafts and burgesses of St Andrews, changing their provost, chose Captain W. Murray, instead of Learmont laird of Dairsey, which made the latter and his friends so enraged, that one of their number, Balfour of Burley, came into the town by night with a few of his servants, and committed personal violence on some of the inhabitants. Learmont himself assembled all his adherents, intending to revenge himself on those who had opposed his election; which, when it was announced to my uncle, being then rector of the university, and so a civil magistrate, he convoked the whole of the university: and, supported by Lord Lindsay, Sir George Douglas, the townspeople, and others, made the in-

vaders glad to keep their distance. He marched a great part of the day with a white spear in his hand."

1596. Two events occurred this year, which afforded such an exhibition of democratic insolence on the part of Melville and his associates, that it determined the king and his council to use their utmost endeavours to get rid of a religious system which, under the specious plea of defending ecclesiastical rights, gave birth to great tyranny and intolerance.

Melville and a party of his friends, including his nephew James, took occasion to wait on the king, to remonstrate with him regarding his lenient treatment of the Popish lords. It had been previously settled that James should be the spokesman, and accordingly he began in a becoming style; but he had not proceeded far, before Andrew, unable to restrain himself, rudely seized the sleeve of the king's robe, and, calling him "God's silly vassal," thus addressed him:—"I tell you again, as I have told you before divers times, that there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is king James the head of the commonwealth, and there is King Jesus the Head of the Church, whose subject king James is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a head, but a member. Sir, those whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over his Church," meaning himself and his party, "have power and authority from him to govern his spiritual kingdom, both jointly and severally; the which, no Christian king or prince should control or discharge, but fortify and assist: otherwise they are not faithful subjects of Christ and members of his Church. Sir, when you were in your swaddling clothes, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land, in spite of all his enemies." The time when "Christ reigned freely," was during the government of the four regents, than which there never was a time of greater distraction

and misrule in any country.[1] The language and behaviour here adopted by Melville, was very similar to that of Popes Innocent III. and Gregory VII. to the sovereigns of their time; only that they expressed themselves in more dignified language; and their pretensions came with better grace from the successors of St Peter and the acknowledged heads of the Western Church than from a Scottish Presbyterian minister, who had not even undergone any form of ordination, and could show no divine commission for the authority by which he acted.

The next religious outrage which was committed this year, was at St Andrews, by a "Scots worthy" of the name of Black. This person entertained his audience from the pulpit, by telling them that King James, in permitting the Popish lords to return from exile, whither they had been banished for their religion, had "discovered the treachery of his heart; that all kings were devil's bairns; that Satan had now the direction of the court; that the Queen of England was an atheist, and, as to their own queen, it was no use praying for her; that the judges of the land were miscreants, and accepted bribes; that the nobility were godless and degenerate; and the privy councillors cormorants, and men of no religion!"[2] When the preacher was called to account for this offensive language, his brethren made common cause with him, and asserted that he was not answerable to any civil tribunal for an offence which they chose to call an ecclesiastical one. They argued that, being a

[1] The "Historie of James the Sext," *passim*, represents the state of Scotland, during that king's minority, as perhaps unequalled in any nation of Christendom, for deeds of deliberate atrocity and murder, committed by the king's and queen's parties on each other. "As for the Supper of the Lord, it was then out of seasoun, by reasoun tranquillity was banisht the land, and violent dealing was maister of all."—P. 123. See also pp. 85, 167, 168.

[2] Moyse's Memoirs, p. 245.

commissioned minister of the Gospel, he must speak what he believed to be the truth, and obey God rather than man.[1] In order to strengthen their hands, they resorted to the usual expedient of a public *fast*, to be kept on a *Sunday*, "with solemn prayers for averting the judgments which the present courses did threaten." By suiting their prayers and sermons to the occasion, and artfully misrepresenting the real state of affairs, they so far succeeded in their object as to gain over the ignorant multitude to their side. On the other hand, the English ambassador complained of the insult which had been publicly offered to his mistress by the preacher: on which account, as well as for the sake of his own queen, who had been also maligned, James took up the matter seriously, and determined to put a timely check to such unclerical behaviour. In spite of the opposition of the Kirk, headed by Melville, the Privy Council proceeded against the refractory minister; and, having obtained proof of the expressions he had uttered, they found him guilty, and referred his sentence to the king. James, always inclined to the side of mercy, and unwilling that the cause of religion should be hurt through the misconduct of its ministers, contented himself with banishing Black to the north of Scotland for a limited period. Dr M'Crie does not tell his readers what were the charges against this individual; but, being unable to pass them over entirely, and anxious, at the same time, to find some apology for Presbyterian intemperance, he says, "the accusations were odious; but, though it is *probable* he had used expressions which gave occasion for them, there can be little doubt that *his language was wrested*,

[1] See a copy of his declinature in Stevenson's History of the Church and State of Scotland, vol. i. p. 214. He declines the authority of the civil court, because he is the ambassador of Christ, and responsible to him only for what he might utter in the pulpit.

and his meaning misinterpreted." But this matter did not end here. To secure peace for the future, James demanded from the other ministers, that they should subscribe a bond of civil obedience to the constituted authorities, under pain of having their stipends sequestrated. This threat (together with the circumstance of one of the Popish lords having accidentally arrived in Edinburgh at the time, which was interpreted into a secret encouragement of Popery) roused the wrath of Mr Robert Bruce, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, who preached a fiery sermon, in which he cast gross reflections on such statesmen as had given the king their advice in the pending disputes with the Kirk; and warned his audience, that if they did not stoutly resist the court, Popery would soon be the established religion of the land. Another minister, John Welsh, (also a "Scots worthy,") "did rail pitifully against the king, saying he was possessed with a devil; and, one devil being put out, seven worse had entered and taken its place; and that his subjects might lawfully rise, and take the sword out of his hand."[1] This seditious language had the effect de-

[1] Spotswood, p. 430. The "Convocation of Ministers," in their address to the "Christian people of Scotland," in November 1842, (beginning with the solemn words, "Grace be with you, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love,") hold up to their admiration the conduct of Andrew Melville, David Black, Robert Bruce, and John Welsh, as having contended for "the liberty of the Gospel, and the spiritual sovereignty of the Lord Jesus," and call on them to "watch with jealousy, and resist with firmness, every encroachment on the blood-bought liberties of their country." There can be no limits to the arbitrary power of men who, assuming themselves to be the ministers of an invisible king, own subjection to no human authority; claim to be the irresponsible discriminators between things spiritual and things civil, and the sole interpreters of the divine will; and who, in support of these lofty pretensions, set at defiance the decrees of the courts of justice; and, when other weapons fail them, appeal to the passions of the "Christian people." This is a line of conduct diametrically opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, as well as most injurious to the cause of religion; and which a body of Christian ministers, in-

signed by the preachers. The streets of Edinburgh became the scene of as great an uproar as the theatre of Ephesus in the time of St Paul; only that now, the cry among the multitude was, "God and the Kirk;" "the sword of the Lord and of Gideon," until the whole city rose in arms, the greater part not knowing for what purpose they were come together. Happily, however, a sensible "town-clerk" was found in the person of an influential citizen of the name of Watt, who succeeded in persuading the people to do "nothing rashly;" and, assisted by some of his brother tradesmen, rescued the king from the perilous situation in which the mob had placed him, and conducted him in safety to Holyrood House. Next day, it was found that the chief ministers had not diminished their violence, and were resolved to follow up what they had begun; but the magistrates and citizens, whom a night's reflection had brought to a sense of their error, now took part with the king; and the ministers, to avoid imprisonment, made their escape into England.[1]

This proceeding had, upon the whole, a beneficial tendency. It opened the eyes of the people to the real character of their democratical preachers, and increased the power of the king over both church and state. Dr M'Crie, as usual, defends the behaviour of the ministers on this occasion; observing, that "a law which would have had the effect of restraining the ministers of Edinburgh alone from expressing any opinion on matters of state, was more to be dreaded at that time than the presence of 10,000 armed Spaniards in the heart of Scotland!"

The Melvillian establishment had now reached its

stead of being the first to practise and recommend, ought to be the first to repudiate. I must, however, do them the justice to say, that they are true Presbyterians. As their fathers did, so do they.

[1] Spotswood, p. 426.

acme of perfection; and it might have been expected that the good effects which its zealous friends had anticipated, would have been, at length, experienced. So far from it, the Assembly of this year, which met in Edinburgh, complained that the country was deluged with every species of vice and immorality, to an unprecedented degree;[1] *there being* (it is added) *about four hundred parish kirks destitute of the ministry of the Word, besides the kirks of Argyll and the Isles.* What a state of things, after thirty-six years of reformation! Was it any wonder that many of the people returned to Popery? Calderwood, who could not see the *real* cause of all this disorder, accounts for it thus: "this Kirk was now come to the greatest purity that it ever attained unto, [yet about half the parishes of Scotland were without ministers!] so that her beauty was admirable to foreign kirks; but the DEVIL, envying the happiness and laudable proceedings of the ministers and assemblies of the Kirk, stirred up both Papists and politicians to disturb her peace."[2] In other words, he and his party bring their kirk and country into the utmost disorder, and then they call it the work of the devil! But, perhaps, they were right. There are many men who do the work of the devil, and yet are far from being aware of it.

1597. It is an old observation, that no persons need reformation so much as reformers: probably because, in their zeal for the correction of others, they are apt to overlook themselves: they see the mote in their brother's eye, but cannot discern the beam in their own. This was eminently the case with Andrew Melville. His whole attention, at this time, was occupied in moulding the church into a Presbyterian or republican form, which, in his eyes, was a reformation;

[1] Calderwood, p. 319. [2] Ibid. p. 311.

and yet, in his own offices, as principal of St Mary's college and rector of the university, he had allowed the worst abuses to prevail. In a visitation of the university in this year, it is recorded, "Mr Andrew Melville found by voting, that he has not performed the office of a rector in the administration thereof, to the ruling and ordering of the university; that, neither in the government of the college, nor in teaching, nor in the administration of their rents, has conformed him to the reformed foundation and act of parliament." "In the new college," says Spotswood, "whereof the said Mr Andrew had the charge, all things were found out of order; the rents ill-husbanded, and the professions neglected; and, in place of divinity lectures, political questions were often agitated: as, whether the election or succession of kings were the better form of government? how far the royal power extended? and if kings might be censured for abusing the same, and deposed by the Estates of the kingdom?"

The observations of Calderwood and M'Crie, in regard to these abuses, must not be passed over. The former says, "many heavy accusations and complaints were made against Mr A. Melville, at the visitation of the university; but God so assisted him with courage and utterance, that they could find no advantage against him; only they made choice of a new rector, which office, according to custom, he demitted willingly." Melville certainly never wanted "courage and utterance," from whatever source he derived them; but other requisites must have been wanting to clear him from such serious charges as the foregoing. M'Crie is very angry with Spotswood for bringing forward the above heavy accusations against his favourite, and denies that there is any mention made of them in the evidence taken on the occasion. But Spotswood, who was a contemporary, was too much

of a gentleman and a Christian, to assert a falsehood; and, in point of fact, the charges are more than borne out by this very evidence in every particular; except only as to the political subjects of the lectures, which are not mentioned, but which circumstance, M'Crie thinks, was probably *true*, and even justifies Melville for pursuing this line of conduct! The books of accounts he was very unwilling to produce at all, and did not, till compelled by the commissioners.[1]

One Sunday in this year, the king went to the parish church of St Andrews, to hear a sermon from Mr Robert Wallace, whom we have already spoken of, (p. 413.) In the course of it, the preacher advanced something which clashed with the king's sentiments on a point then at issue between him and the Presbyterian ministers. The king rose and contradicted the preacher before the whole audience. Andrew Melville, who was present, got up in his turn, defended Wallace, and sharply reprimanded James for his unseasonable interference, "threatening him and his counsellors with fearful judgments, if they repented not." Soon after this, a slight earthquake occurred in the West Highlands of Scotland, and James Melville in his Diary, where he tells the above story, (p. 274,) gravely ascribes the earthquake to God's displeasure against the king for interrupting the discourse of his servant Mr Wallace, which he compares to Uzzah's laying hold of the ark of God! This was a strange opinion in one who had called the distinction between the clergy and laity, "the pride of papistry, and arrogancy of the shavelings." According to his own principles, the king had as good a right to lay hold of the ark of God, as Mr Wallace. But be this as it may, James

[1] Printed "Evidence," pp. 196, 197. This evidence was in manuscript at the time M'Crie wrote his life of Melville, and may have escaped his notice.

must have been very ill advised, to subject himself to the abuse of these unmannerly ministers, by contradicting them in their pulpits.

This Wallace was accused, in the course of the same year, by a Fife gentleman, of casting certain injurious aspersions upon his character, in his sermons. As the Presbytery of St Andrews refused to take up the charge, Wallace was summoned before his majesty's commissioners, whose jurisdiction he refused to acknowledge. Witnesses were called, who proved the truth of the allegations; but still he declined the judgment of the civil court, though urged to confess his error by some of his own party. It came out in evidence, that he had gone so far as, in his sermons, to threaten the examiners of the witnesses, in the above-mentioned case of his friend Black. On this, Calderwood cautiously observes, "I have no further knowledge of this matter at present."[1] But Dr M'Crie is more bold, and says, "This might have been *excused*, as proceeding from the amiable feeling of sympathy with his colleague!"[2] The consequence of these delinquencies on the part of Wallace was, that both he and his colleague Black, who had by this time resumed his duties at St Andrews, were removed from their charges on the same day. Dr M'Crie calls them "two faithful and laborious ministers." Their hatred of the throne and the altar no doubt covered a multitude of sins. They had been placed at St Andrews through the influence of Andrew Melville.[3]

[1] P. 411. [2] Life of A. Melville, vol. ii. p. 34.

[3] Moyse's Memoirs, p. 253. The reign of Melvillianism was not only an era of persecution to all who did not conform to it, but an era also of a superstitious dread of witchcraft. The Spalding Club of Aberdeen has lately printed a volume, entitled "Miscellany," which contains an account of the trials of fifty witches, of whom *twenty-three women and one man were burnt* in Aberdeen within twelve months, in the years 1596 and 1597! Some of those who were only suspected of

1598. An act of Assembly made it imperative on all classes of the community to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, at least once a-year, from the ministers of the Kirk. The object was, that it might be seen who were, and who were not, Papists. Such an instance of intolerance, and prostitution of the holy eucharist, needs no comment. The same year, an act was passed against witches, and those who set them at liberty after conviction.[1] The reign of puritanical democracy is invariably a "reign of terror." In this year also, a General Assembly was held at Dundee, in the presence of the king. Andrew Melville, and John Johnston, one of the professors of St Mary's college, appeared among the members, in their capacity of *doctors*, the second office of their new order of priesthood. The king reminded them that, by a late regulation, they could not sit there, unless as commissioners of presbyteries, burghs, or universities. The following dialogue then ensued: "*A. Melville.* We have a doctorial charge in the Kirk which is ecclesiastical. *King.* I will allow nothing to be done till both you and Mr Johnston are withdrawn. The two "doctors" were then removed, and desired to confine themselves to their lodging. *John Davidson.* The Assembly is wronged by the discharge of these men. *King.* I will not hear one word of that. *Davidson.* Then we must crave help of Him that will hear us." Such is a specimen of the discreditable altercations which James was in the practice of carrying on with the Presbyterian ministers, at this time, in their Church courts!

The immediate result of the foregoing disorderly

witchcraft, were branded on the cheek and banished! Precisely the same thing happened when the same party obtained the ascendancy, during the Grand Rebellion, as we shall see in the sequel.

[1] Calderwood, pp. 836, 837.

proceedings, was that, notwithstanding the opposition of the two Melvilles and their coadjutors, means were pursued to restore a modified Episcopacy; so that the same individuals who had the satisfaction of founding Presbyterianism, lived long enough to suffer the mortification of witnessing its overthrow. It was determined, as a preliminary step, that the vacant bishoprics should be filled up, though as yet unendowed with any temporalities; the king choosing an approved minister for each, out of a given number nominated by the General Assembly. Aberdeen and Argyll had still their titular bishops, who had been connived at by the Presbyterian establishment, on the ground that they were at the same time pastors of congregations. Dunkeld, Brechin, and Dunblane, had also titulars; while Galloway and the Isles were so dilapidated as "scarce they were remembered to have been." But St Andrews and Glasgow were still in the hands of the Duke of Lennox; Moray was possessed by Lord Spynie, and the see of Orkney by the earl of the same! In Ross and Caithness some small provision was still left; to the former of which Mr David Lindsay, and to the latter, Mr George Gladstones, now minister of St Andrews, were appointed. But as, according to Spotswood, they could not get any "settling" in these dioceses, they continued for the present in their parochial cures.

This Gladstones had been minister of Airdbirlett, and was brought to St Andrews by the king, in order to replace Messrs Black and Wallace after their removal; on which occasion, we are told, he was received by the inhabitants "with great applause." This was certainly no proof of his merit; for when the people are right in their judgment of public characters, it is as often, I fear, from chance as from intelligence; but in this instance, it showed that they were beginning

to grow tired of puritanical democracy, and disposed for a better and more moderate state of things. Another object the king had in view in bringing Gladstones to St Andrews was, as Martine informs us, "of purpose to balance and poise Mr Andrew Melville, and to guard the students and universitie against his principles, and to fence them from being tinged with his seditious and turbulent way; and many a hote bickering there was betwixt them thereupon."

1602. "Mr A. Melville prophesying [preaching] at the exercise upon Eph. v. 11., about the end of June, touched the present corruptions of the Kirk, and namely (*i. e.* by name) of the ministry of St Andrews." Gladstones was one of those against whom Melville took this opportunity of aiming his personalities. "The king, upon their complaint, went to St Andrews in July after, and caused charge him to keep ward within the precincts of the new college, under the pain of rebellion. By the queen's intercession, he obtained leave to travel six miles about St Andrews."[1]

1603. When James succeeded to the throne of England, his predilections in favour of Episcopacy naturally increased. In a speech which he pronounced at Hampton Court, he congratulated himself that, "by divine providence, he had at length been brought into the land of promise, where religion was professed in its purity, and where he sat among grave, learned, and reverend men; not being now, as formerly, a king without state or honour, in a place whence order was banished, and where beardless boys braved him to his face." Dr M'Crie says, that James made use of his new power "for the overthrow of the liberties of the Presbyterian ministers." He very properly wished to

[1] Calderwood, p. 453.

have but one established Church for both his kingdoms; but he deprived the Presbyterian ministers of no liberty, but the liberty of doing as they pleased.

1605. Martine gives the following anecdote of Gladstones under this year. "He used always to preside at the public giving of degrees in the universitie, whereof *virtute officii* he was chancellor, if he was upon the place. So great were his pairts, learning, and readiness, that in the year 1605, the plague breaking out in the town of St Andrews, it is reported that the rector, and all the universitie, in a morning about five o'clock, adrest him in bed for breaking up the teaching, and dissolving the schollars: and it is said, he bade them be ready at the ringing of the bell; and that within two or three hours he appeared in public, discoursed upon the theame *de fœtu abortivo*, conferring the degrees himself, and so broke up the universitie for that year." This was a curious subject for an archbishop to lecture upon; but it seems to prove that at least one branch of medicine was taught in the university at that time.

1606. The act of 1587, which had annexed the bishops' lands to the crown, was repealed; the persons to whom they had been granted received an equivalent in money or abbey lands; and the temporalities of the thirteen bishoprics were restored. At the same time, Gladstones was made titular Archbishop of St Andrews; and the Duke of Lennox, who had enjoyed the temporalities for the nineteen previous years, now restored them to the see, on receiving those of the priory in their stead. The archbishop was also put in possession of the revenues of the archdeaconry and vicarage of St Andrews, and the provostry of Kirkhough, all of which put together, greatly dilapidated by the secular hands through which they had passed since the Reformation, made up but a very moderate archi-

episcopal income. The castle of St Andrews was given to the Earl of Dunbar; but in six years after it was restored to the archbishopric.[1]

Subsequent acts of parliament, and of the General Assembly, increased the powers and privileges of the hierarchy, though not without great opposition from the parity ministers. Their diocesan commissary courts were restored, the clergy were required to take an oath of canonical obedience to them, they were made permanent moderators of synods and presbyteries; and though they were still liable to be deprived by the General Assembly, yet this body could not meet without the king's permission, nor could a sentence of deprivation be of any effect without the royal sanction.

1609. The town-hall of St Andrews,[2] was the scene of a trial which, at the time, caused a great sensation in Scotland, though its details are now of little interest. Lord Balmerino, principal secretary of state for Scotland, was accused of having, in the king's name, written a letter to the pope, soliciting preferment for one Chisholm, a Scottish Romanist priest, in which letter he styled the pope, *sanctitas*, *beatissime pater*, &c., and called himself *filius*. This letter the king had signed, without being made aware of its contents, or the person to whom it was addressed. For this offence it was thought necessary to try Lord Balmerino on a charge of high treason. He was found guilty, and sentenced to lose his head; and though the sentence was not carried into effect, he was imprisoned for life, degraded from his honours, and after a few years, died of a broken heart.

1610. In October, Gladstones "held a diocesan

[1] See Chap. ix. vol. ii.

[2] The city arms, and the date 1561, are on the posterior part of this building, which is now used as a jail.

synod in an aisle of the kirk of St Andrews, where (whereas) before, the assemblies were wont to be holden in St Leonard's college. On the east side was set a table covered with green cloth, and a green velvet cushion upon it, and a stool beside, for the clerk. After prayer, Mr John Mitchelson was chosen clerk." Then followed a dispute between Gladstones and some of the ministers, as to his right of being moderator in virtue of his episcopal office. A similar dispute occurred between the same parties at Haddington, in the following month.[1] "At the end of this meeting," says Calderwood, "while the bishop was going to dinner, he had almost broken his leg; for a great stone, at the entry of the kirk door, slipped within, and fell down with him, howbeit two or three hundred had gone out before him; whereupon a pretty epigram was made in Latin." It is evident from this, that the Presbyterian historian would not only have been pleased had Gladstones broken his leg, but that he would have ascribed it to a divine judgment.

Before finishing this chapter, I will briefly advert to the final history of Andrew Melville, of whom I have already had occasion to say so much. In the autumn of 1606, he and several of his brethren, including his nephew James, were sent for by the king, to hold a religious conference in London with certain divines of the English Church, among whom were, the Bishops of London, Lincoln, and Chichester, besides the Scottish titular Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow. It would be foreign to my object to enter into the details of this conference.[2] Let it suffice to say, that Melville's behaviour was most violent and refractory, and that he used grossly insulting language against the Church of England, her bishops, and her

[1] Calderwood, p. 642.

[2] Bishop Russell's History of the Church in Scotland, vol. ii. p. 77.

ceremonies. Spotswood, who was present, says that, "he behaved himself insolently, and more like a madman than a divine." James, who had borne long with him, and would before this, no doubt, have used effectual means to check his insolence, had he felt his hands strong enough, was determined that he should not have the power to do more mischief. He therefore not only refused to allow him to return to Scotland, but, as guilty of the charge of *scandalum magnatum*, he sent him to the Tower of London, where he was confined three years. He was then permitted to retire to Sedan in France, where he became Professor of Divinity, and died after a lingering illness in 1622, in the seventy-seventh year of his age.[1] Archbishop Spotswood makes this reflection on his death, that, "whereas he and his party, for a long while after the death of Archbishop Adamson, (whom they had excommunicated in 1586, and treated in every respect with the greatest cruelty and injustice,) never ceased to hold forth in their discourses, that all his sufferings were the judgments of God upon him; so now, it might have been retorted with the same justice upon this Mr Melville himself, if we were warranted in measuring the love of God, either to persons or causes, by their external accidents."

Dr M'Crie is of opinion, that "next to Knox, Scotland owes a deeper debt of gratitude to Melville than to any other individual"! The same reverend biographer makes the following very just observation in another part of his writings, with which I will conclude this chapter, as it is strictly applicable to himself:—"It is surprising how much prejudice will blind and distort the judgment, even of men of learning."

[1] James Melville, who was also banished from Scotland, died at Berwick in 1614.

CHAPTER XIV.

Lives and Times of the Archbishops of St Andrews, from the restoration of Canonical Episcopacy in 1610, *till the outbreak of the Grand Rebellion in* 1638.

XLVI. George Gladstones, A.D. 1610–1615.

Though Episcopacy had been again partially restored in Scotland, it was still defective in several particulars; but its chief defect was the want of canonical consecration in the bishops, and consequently, of ordination in the priesthood. James and the English hierarchy saw the importance of supplying this want in the Scottish Church, and now took measures accordingly. The king sent for the Archbishop of Glasgow, and the Bishops of Brechin and Galloway, namely, Spotswood, Lamb, and Hamilton, and told them that "he had recovered the temporalities of the bishopries out of lay hands at great expense, and bestowed them, as he hoped, upon worthy persons; but as he could not make them bishops, and as they could not assume that honour to themselves, he had, therefore, called them to England, to receive regular consecration from the bishops there, that, on their return, they might communicate the same to the rest, and thereby stop the mouths of adversaries of all denominations." To this Spotswood replied, that "their only fear was, lest this might be taken for a sort of subjection to the Church of England, because of the old pretensions that way." But the king told him that he had provided against that danger, by excluding the two English archbishops from officiating on the

occasion, and appointing the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath, to perform the consecration. These bishops met accordingly for this purpose; but before proceeding, an unexpected question arose. The titular bishops had never received any regular ordination; and a doubt was suggested whether they should not be episcopally ordained, before being consecrated? After some discussion, it was agreed that, as the greater comprehended the less, and as there were not wanting examples in the primitive church of laymen being made bishops *per saltum*,[1] it would, therefore, be sufficient to consecrate them at once; which was done in the chapel of London House, on the 21st October, 1610; and thus the Scottish bishops obtained the reality of that high character which they had hitherto borne only in name.[2] On their return to Scotland, they consecrated their brother bishops, some at Leith, some at St Andrews; so that, after many years of change and disorder, the king and all his good subjects had the satisfaction of seeing a regular ecclesiastical order established in both kingdoms. James also acted with great judgment in his selection of bishops for Scotland; for his uniform practice was, when a see became vacant, to direct the other bishops to name a certain number of presbyters whom they thought best qualified to perform the episcopal duties, and out of these he chose one; which was preserving a due harmony between the rights of the church on the one hand, and the prerogatives of the crown on the other. These prudent measures would, it was hoped, tend to

[1] St Ambrose was thus made bishop of Milan, Nestorious of Constantinople, and Enchorius of Lyons. See other examples in Bingham's Antiquities, book ii. ch. x.

[2] Calderwood says their consecration was "of no force, and ought not to be acknowledged," because it wanted the sanction of a General Assembly! In his eyes, an Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland was of more importance than a General Council of all Christendom.

promote pure and undefiled religion, and thereby suppress that restless spirit of puritanical democracy which never fails to engender strife whenever it gains the ascendancy. It would have been happy for Scotland could she have appreciated, and proved herself worthy of, the privilege now bestowed upon her; yet, within thirty years from this time, a spirit burst forth in Great Britain of so factious and frantic a character, that it swept away the throne and the altar, and all the national institutions along with them.

With respect to Archbishop Gladstones' personal history and character, I find very few particulars in addition to those I have recorded in the last chapter. It appears from the records of kirk-sessions and presbyteries, which are still extant, that besides opening the ordinary meetings of the clergy with a sermon, he regularly visited the churches subject to his jurisdiction, and was in the habit of preaching in all of them. The anti-episcopal writers of the period are somewhat severe in their censure of him, one of whom asserts, that "he indulged night and day in *baccho* and *tobacco*;" but such, it is well known, was the violent party spirit of that class of men, that, if a bishop took his wine and his pipe after dinner and supper, however moderately, it was sufficient to raise a scandal as to his intemperance. Archbishop Spotswood his successor, who is a more impartial witness, thus mentions his death and character:—"The next spring, Mr George Gladstones archbishop of St Andrews, departed this life: a man of good learning, ready utterance, and great invention; but of an easy nature, and induced, by those he trusted, to do many things hurtful to the see, especially in leasing the tithes of his benefice for many ages to come; esteeming (which is the error of many churchmen) that, by this means, he should purchase the love and friendship of men;

whereas there is no sure friendship but that which is joined with respect; and to the preserving of this, nothing conduceth more than a wise and prudent administration of church rents wherewith they are entrusted. He left behind him in writing, a declaration of his judgment touching matters then controverted in the Church, professing that 'he had accepted the episcopal function upon good warrant, and that his conscience did never accuse him for anything done that way.' This he did to obviate the rumours which he foresaw would be dispersed after his death, either of his recantation, or of some trouble of spirit that he was cast into, (for these are the usual practices of the puritan sect,) whereas he ended his days most piously, and to the great comfort of all the beholders. His corpse was interred in the south-east aisle of the parish church, and the funeral [sermon] preached by Mr William Cowper bishop of Galloway, who was lately before preferred, upon the decease of Mr Gavin Hamilton bishop of that see; a man for courage, true kindness, and zeal to the church, never enough to be commended."

How truly Spotswood predicted that Gladstones' memory would suffer from the pen of "the puritan sect," may be seen from Calderwood's and M'Crie's account of this prelate. "Mr George Gladstones," says the first, "departed this life in the castle of St Andrews, on the 2d of May. At the desire of his wife and children, he subscribed some few lines, wherein he approved of the present course, to procure them the king's favour. We have heard of his strange disease and senseless end, in general, but I have not learnt certainly the particulars. He was buried on the 7th of June, in St Andrews. A canopy of black velvet was borne up by four men above the empty coffin, for his corpse was buried before. Mr William

Cowper made the funeral sermon, full of vile flattery and lies, for which he was derided by the people."[1] Dr M'Crie follows in the same wake, and very characteristically says, "he had a competent share of pedantry, was abundantly vain-glorious, and at the same time possessed all the obsequiousness which is requisite in one who is to be raised to the primacy." In a word, he was guilty of the unpardonable sin of being Archbishop of St Andrews.

In the acts of the Scottish parliament, A.D. 1612, there is a long contract betwixt this archbishop and the city of St Andrews. He confirms to the town various privileges; such as, the shore dues, the free use of the links, with "the mussill scalp to the water of Eden, and the south and north haughs: but prejudice of the infeftment grantit to Lawrance Wan, to sett nettes upon the sands for fowling to my lord archbishoppis use." On the other hand, the archbishop receives an annual pecuniary compensation; the privilege of being first served with all goods imported into the harbour; and the power of selecting the provost, dean of guild, and bailies, out of a leet furnished by themselves. They engage to "lay and repair the hail calsages [causeways] of said citie, within the space of five years." The contract has this curious addition: "And also, in respect my lord archbishop is acquantit with the puir estate of the said citie and inhabitants thereof, that his lordship shall intercead with his majestie, and use all possible moyen to obtain of his hienes, ane discharge of the sowme of 2000 merkis money, in the qlk the said cittie was confynit [fined] for the allegit ryot committed at the eschapping of Walter Geddie." What the precise event was which is here alluded to, we have no means of asser-

[1] P. 650.

taining. The town records do not extend so far back as 1612. I have never seen a seal of this archbishop.

XLVII. John Spotswood, A.D. 1615–1639.

This pious and amiable prelate, was the son of the Superintendant of Lothian, one of the most judicious and temperate of the early reformers. I have not generally said much of the bishops of St Andrews previous to their elevation to the see, unless connected with something which followed; nor need I depart from this rule, in the present instance, farther than to observe, that Spotswood's early history was, in all respects, highly honourable to him. He was made archbishop of Glasgow in 1603; but that appointment being previous to the restoration of a true Episcopacy in Scotland, was merely titular, and the income arising from it very small; but, to make him some amends, the king settled upon him a pension of £80 yearly.[1] "At his entry," says his biographer, in the preface to his History of the Church, "he found the revenues of it so dilapidate, that there was not £100 sterling of yearly rent left, to tempt to a new sacrilege. But such was his care and husbandry for his successors, that he greatly improved it; and yet, with so much content to his diocese, that generally, both the nobility and gentry and the whole city of Glasgow, were as unwilling to part with him as if he had been in the place of a tutelar angel to them." When he succeeded to the primacy, he found its revenues in a better state than those of Glasgow; Episcopacy having, as we have seen, been fully restored in the interval. Still, they were greatly diminished compared with what they had been in former times; but he succeeded

1 Rymer, vol. xvi. p. 614.

in recovering a great part of what had been swallowed up by the crown during the confusion engendered by the Reformation, and which King James, who always proved himself a nursing father to the Church, willingly surrendered as soon as the fact was made known to him. Such, in short, was Spotswood's zeal and activity in promoting the prosperity of the Church, that, in furtherance of this object, he is said to have performed, in the course of his life, no less than fifty journeys from Scotland to London.

In the year 1616, James VI. came to the resolution of visiting his ancient kingdom of Scotland, whereupon great preparations were made for his due reception. Every town which he meant to take in his way, had timely notice sent to it. Among these was St Andrews. One John Knox, provost of the city at that time, and the magistrates, in their letter to the Lord Chancellor of Scotland, dated 1st December 1616, state that "thair ar fund within our citie the number of three scoir fed oxen, quhilk, by Goddis assistance, shall be in readiness at his majestie's cumming. And for contents of your last letter, concerning preparing of lugings, stablis, and all utheris mentioned thereintill, we sal nought fail to endeavoir our selfis, to our uttermost, to give your lordship satisfaction to our power and possibilitie."

In June 1617, the king held a parliament at Edinburgh, at which it was enacted, among other things, that "whatsoever his majesty should determine in the external government of the Church, with the advice of the archbishops, bishops, and a competent number of the ministry, should have the strength of a law." "This coming to the ministers' ears," says Spotswood, "they began to stir, as if the whole rites and ceremonies of England were to be brought upon them without their consent. Whereupon, the ministers that

were in town, were called together and warned to be quiet; for that such a general act did not lay upon them any bond; and, if any particular was urged, the same should be communicated to them, and nothing concluded without their consent." With this assurance they seemed to be satisfied; yet the very next Sunday, Mr Struthers, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, "did unhappily break out in his sermon upon these matters, condemning the rites received in the Church of England, and praying God to save Scotland from the same." This led to the drawing up of a "protestation" by a number of ministers; at the head of whom were Archibald Simson of Dalkeith, and David Calderwood the historian, whom we have so often quoted.

The king reached St Andrews on the 17th day of the following month, where the first thing that was done was the delivery of a Latin speech before his majesty, in the name of the town, by "Maister Harrie Dansteen, schoolmaister," who is designated "civitatis Andreanæ orator, et juventutis ibidem moderator." The king next proceeded to the parish church of the city, at the porch of which another speech was made to him in name of the university, by the rector, Mr Peter Bruce principal of St Leonard's college.[1] A disputation by the members of the university was then held in the king's presence, under the presidency of Mr Robert Howie[2] principal of St Mary's. On the 12th day of

[1] I have a cast of the seal of the college, at the time Bruce was Principal. It has upon it the figure of St Leonard, the Principal's arms below, with the initials M. P. B., and the legend "S. collegii divi Leonardi, 1617."

[2] This Robert Howie had succeeded Andrew Melville. He was a man of some learning, and the author of several treatises, but, in his religious sentiments, a perfect "vicar of Bray." He was a Presbyterian under the Melvillian system; he was now an Episcopalian; and in 1638 he again joined the Presbyterians: being determined, whatever might happen, to live and die Principal of St Mary's. He was suc

the month were discussed the following problemata philosophica:—1. An solum regimen monarchicum sit naturale? 2. An mulierum et puerorum imperia licita sit? 3. An homo lumine naturæ scire possit mundum a Deo esse creatum? The king's chaplain, Dr John Young, then conferred the degree of D.D. by *mandamus* on the principals of the three colleges, Howie, Bruce, and Martine, on William Forbes, afterwards bishop of Edinburgh, and John Strang, afterwards Principal of the university of Glasgow; which was the first time that degrees in divinity had been granted by any university in Scotland since the Reformation. "This novelty," says Calderwood, "was brought in amongst us without advice and consent of the Kirk." On the 17th, the king knighted fifteen of his band of gentlemen pensioners.[1]

When these ceremonies were completed, James held a consultation with Archbishop Spotswood and several other Scottish bishops and clergymen, in the chapel of the castle, on what was afterwards so well known under the appellation of the "Five Articles of Perth," which had been submitted to the consideration of a General Assembly at Aberdeen the year before, and which the king was very anxious should be adopted by the Church. As that part of our history we are now entering upon, is closely connected with these "Articles," it is proper I should state that they were in brief these:—1. That the sacrament of baptism might be administered in private houses, in cases of sickness. 2. That the other sacrament, in similar cases, might also be administered

ceeded by Samuel Rutherford in 1648. His device, a *fleur de lis*, and initials D. R. H., may yet be seen on various parts of his college.

[1] See their names, and a full account of the above proceedings, in Nicholl's Progresses and Public Processions of King James VI., vol. iii. p. 358-367.

privately. 3. That the latter should be received in a kneeling attitude. 4. That young persons should be brought to the bishop for confirmation. 5. That Christmas-day, Good-Friday, Easter-day, Ascension-day, and Whitsunday should be observed as religious fasts or festivals. James was naturally anxious to bring about a perfect similarity between the Churches of England and Scotland, now that they were both under one temporal sovereign. And to this he was the more induced, both because he was persuaded of the Apostolical origin of the constitution and rights of the former, and because he justly thought a uniformity in religion would cement the political union of his dominions. It is also deserving of notice, that in enjoining the above "Articles" on his Scottish subjects, he was doing no more than what the laws of their own reformed church empowered him to do; for the Confession of Faith of 1567, which was then, and is to this day, one of their standards, declares,—"To kings, princes, rulers, and magistrates, we affirm, that chiefly and most principally the conservation and purgation of religion appertains; so that not only are they appointed for civil policie, but also for maintenance of true religion, and for suppressing idolatrie. And therefore we confess and avow, that such as resist a supreme power doing that quhilk appertains to his charge, do resist God his ordinance, and therefore cannot be guiltless."[1] Now it is certain, that James conscientiously believed that, in introducing the foregoing Articles, he was "maintaining the true religion." It is certain also, that we have just as much warrant for them as for infant baptism, and the observance of the first, instead of the seventh day of the week, namely, the uninterrupt-

[1] The Westminster Assembly of Divines, at a subsequent period, in their Confession of Faith, gave still higher powers to the civil magistrate.

ed example of the Church from the Apostolic age. The king's subjects, therefore, in rejecting these Articles, as they afterwards did with the utmost violence, were not only denying a religious authority to which they had voluntarily submitted in other points, but were, by their own admission, "resisting the ordinance of God," and consequently were "not guiltless." And accordingly, for their national guilt in this respect, they afterwards suffered a severe punishment, in a most calamitous rebellion of twenty years' duration. Besides this, we have at least as much reason to commemorate the leading events of the Christian dispensation, as the Jews had to commemorate those of the Mosaic; and if there were anniversaries, by divine appointment, in which the *shadow* was celebrated, surely the Christian Church was justified in setting apart days in honour of the *substance*. But, as we shall see in due time, neither reason, nor religion, nor antiquity, nor authority of any kind, nor even the solemn decision of the General Assembly ratified by Parliament, was of any avail to arrest the progress of puritanical democracy.

The following is the speech which James delivered to the clergy assembled in the chapel of the castle of St Andrews, on the subject of the Five Articles:—

"What and how great my care hath been for this church, as well before as since my going into England, is so well known to you all, that I neither need, nor do I mean to speak much of it, lest any should think I am seeking thanks for what I have done. It sufficeth me that God knows my intention is, and ever was, to have his true worship maintained, and a decent and comely order established in the Church. But of you I must complain, and of your causeless jealousies, even when my meaning towards you is best. Before my coming home to visit this kingdom,

being advertised that, in your last Assembly, an act was made for gathering the Acts of the Church, and putting them in form, I desired a few articles to be inserted. One was, for the yearly commemoration of our Saviour's greatest blessings bestowed upon mankind, as, his nativity, passion, resurrection, ascension, and the descent of the Holy Spirit: another, for the private use of both sacraments in urgent and necessary cases: a third, for the reverend administration of his holy supper: and a fourth, for catechising and confirming young children by bishops. It was answered, that these particulars had not been moved in any of the Church Assemblies, and so could not be inserted with the rest; which excuse I admitted, and was not minded to press them any more, till you, after advice, did give your consent thereto. Yet, when in the last parliament I desired my prerogative to be declared in the making of the ecclesiastical laws, certain of your number did mutinously assemble themselves, and form a protestation to cross my just desires. But I will pass that, among many other wrongs I have received at your hands. The errand for which I have now called you is, to hear what your scruples are, in these points; and the reasons, if any you have, why the same ought not to be admitted. I mean not to do anything against reason; and on the other part, my demands being just and religious, you must not think that I will be refused or resisted. It is a power innated, and a special prerogative which we that are Christian kings have, to order and dispose of such external things in the policy of the Church, as we, by advice of our bishops, shall find most fitting. And for your approving or disapproving, deceive not yourselves: I will never regard it, unless you bring me a reason which I cannot answer."

When the clergy had heard this address, they fell

on their knees; and having requested and obtained leave to retire to the parish church, for private consultation, they deliberated there for two hours on the subject proposed to them; at the end of which time they returned, and intimated to the king their opinion that the Articles would be agreed to by a General Assembly of the Church. James was not disposed to put much confidence in this opinion; but, upon some of the clergy engaging to use their endeavours to promote his wishes, it was agreed that an Assembly should be summoned to meet in the November following at St Andrews.

When the matter was thus far arranged, the king summoned before the Court of High Commission, Messrs Simson and Calderwood, to answer for the part which they had taken in regard to the "protestation" already mentioned. Simson pleaded sickness as an excuse for his absence; but Calderwood appeared, and engaged in a long conversation, or rather controversy, with the king, on the subject at issue. This divine had long been contumacious, for which he had been no farther punished than by being confined to his own parish of Crailing in Roxburghshire. But it was now deemed expedient to adopt stronger measures against him. His argument with James he has himself given at some length in his Church History,[1] in which he very naturally endeavours to strengthen his own case, and weaken that of his royal opponent. The result was, that as he justified the part he had acted, sentence of temporary supension from his office was pronounced upon him. He denied that that court had power to suspend him, or inflict any ecclesiastical punishment upon him; and intimated his determination, in defiance of it, to go on as before in the perform-

[1] P. 680.

ance of his parochial functions. On this account, his first sentence was changed into one of immediate imprisonment, and final banishment. "For carrying himself irreverently," says Spotswood, who was present, "and breaking forth into speeches not becoming a subject, he was committed to the town-house of St Andrews, and afterwards banished the kingdom." His sentence of banishment was not, however, carried into effect till two years after, when he again offended the king and council by writing a book against the Perth Articles. But though banished, he contrived to print his books in Holland, and to smuggle them into Scotland, where they were dispersed by his party, and did a great deal of mischief.[1]

On the 4th of November, the same year, the General Assembly was announced by public proclamation, and sound of trumpet, at the market-cross of Edinburgh, to be held at St Andrews on the 25th of the same month. It met accordingly, under the Commissionership of Lords Binning, Carnegy, and Kilsyth. Archdeacon Gladstones preached in the *morning*, and Archbishop Spotswood in the *forenoon*. In regard to three of the Five Articles above-mentioned, the consideration of them was postponed till the next Assembly; but, in the meantime, it was agreed that the Lord's Supper might be given to sick persons at their own houses; and that the clergy, in the public celebration of this sacrament, should give the elements out of their own hands to the people, saying these words, in giving the bread, "Take, eat, this is the body of the Lord Jesus Christ, which was broken for you; do this in remembrance of him:" and in giving

[1] He afterwards returned home, assisted at the rebel assembly of 1638, and finally, died at Jedburgh in 1651. Bishop Sage, in his "Fundamental Charter of Presbytry," has detected him of often misquoting public documents in his Church History, in order to support his bad cause. He is canonized among the "Scots worthies."

the cup, "Drink, this is the blood of Jesus Christ, shed for you; do this in remembrance of him." When James learnt that this was the utmost extent of their doings, he was very angry; but contented himself in the meantime with ordering the bishops to keep the ensuing Christmas-day as a festival, and to withhold the stipends of the disobedient ministers. Next year, the Assembly met again at Perth, under the Commissionership of Lords Haddington, Carnegy, and Scone, and the Moderatorship of Spotswood. The latter preached the opening sermon, which lasted two hours; and Dr Young dean of Winchester read the king's letter, in which he found great fault for doing so little at St Andrews the year before, but hoped they would now be more studious of his wishes, and of their own religious welfare. In the end, after a discussion of three days, which was carried on with considerable warmth by the opposing parties, the whole Five Articles were approved by a majority of eighty-six to forty-one; and shortly after they were ratified by parliament.

James would very gladly have followed up this enactment with the introduction of the English Liturgy, and thus have completely assimilated the two established churches; but, by the advice of the bishops, he postponed that measure for the present. He was anxious to have it adopted for another reason: that some of the refractory ministers were in the habit of praying *at* him and his measures, in their extemporaneous addresses, and thus inflaming the minds of their congregations against him. But for the same reason that he wished to deprive these men of this formidable weapon of attack, they were no less desirous to preserve it, and consequently strenuously opposed all his endeavours to tie them down to the use of any liturgy, however unexceptionable. A few years after this notwithstanding, he had

no difficulty in introducing the English Liturgy into St Mary's college, St Andrews. Calderwood thus mentions the fact:—"Upon the 15th of January 1623, Master Robert Howie principal of the new college, Dr Wedderburn, and Dr Melvin, were directed by a letter from Dr Young, in the king's name, to use the English Liturgy in the new college, when all the students were present, at morning and evening prayers; which was presently put in execution, notwithstanding they wanted the warrant of any General Assembly, or of any continued practice of the form in time bypast, since the Reformation. But such was the iniquity of the time, that the authority of our General Assemblies, which were worn out of use, and the customs of our Kirk were not regarded by temporizing ministers." It was quite impossible to satisfy Calderwood and the party that acted with him. If anything disagreeable to them were done without the consent of a General Assembly, they raised an outcry against it on that account; and if it were done *with* such consent, they still objected, on the pretext that the Assembly was under court influence, and ought not therefore to be obeyed! About the same time, the Liturgy was adopted in the chapel of Holyroodhouse, Edinburgh, (which chapel served, at that time, as the parish church of the Canongate,) where it was uniformly read and acquiesced in, down to the year of its tumultuous rejection in the same city: which is a proof that the people had no objection to it, and that the opposition to it arose from other causes.

But, though the king had gained his object in regard to the Five Articles, he did not at first insist on a very rigid compliance with them. Some congregations declined receiving the Lord's Supper kneeling; and so long as they behaved quietly, they were permitted to follow the old method without disturbance.

A few ministers, it is true, were deprived for nonconformity; but it was generally those whose refusal was accompanied with expressions of disloyalty to the sovereign, or of insult towards their brethren who set an example of obedience.[1] And what other treatment could they expect? How could they hope to be allowed to remain in the communion of the Church, and in the quiet enjoyment of their benefices, when they obstinately refused obedience to the law of their own General Assembly, ratified by the king and parliament? Besides, what opinion are we to form of the piety of men who could object to receive the holy eucharist in the humble posture of kneeling? What are we to think of their charity to the souls of their parishioners, who could refuse to administer the sacraments in private to those who were at the point of death? What conscientious objection could they plead to young persons solemnly engaging to take upon themselves their baptismal vow at confirmation? And, finally, what reverence could they have for their Redeemer, (whom yet they professed to reverence far more than their opponents did,) when they refused to commemorate the anniversaries of his birth, his crucifixion, his resur-

[1] Some of these misguided men went to America, with a view to enjoy greater liberty of conscience. An idea may be formed of their true character, by the following regulations which they drew up for the government of their infant colony:—

No. 17. "No one shall run of a Sabbath-day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, except reverently to and from church."

No. 18. "No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep houses, cut hair, or shave, on a Sabbath day."

No. 19. "No husband shall kiss his wife, and no mother shall kiss her child, on the Sabbath day."

No. 20. "No one shall read common-prayer, keep Christmas, or saints' days; make mince pies, dance, or play on any instrument of music, except the drum, the trumpet, and the Jew's-harp."

If people *will* be intolerant, pharisaical observers of Sunday, and enemies to innocent pleasures, it is, at least, some consolation to find, as we generally *do* find, that they are, at the same time, haters of our Liturgy; because it proves that the spirit of that noble production is hostile to their low-minded and sectarian prejudices.

rection, his ascension, and the descent of his Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost? and that, too, at the very time that they were in the habit of keeping parochial fast-days of their own appointment, for the most factious purposes. In short, they mistook a personal obstinacy, and dogged resistance to authority, for Christian resolution. As to their voluntary fast-days, there was no doubt much worldly policy in them; for the preachers adapted their extempore prayers and sermons to the times, and never failed thereby to add a new stimulus to the fanaticism of their hearers. These men were at this time but few in number; but they made up for this deficiency by zeal, perseverance, and clamour; they were wiser in their generation than the friends of decency and good order. A modern historian[1] truly remarks: "The daily experience of human affairs supplies ample proof that a minority, otherwise contemptible, often achieves by perseverance, violence, and bold misrepresentation, a victory over the most venerated institutions, when only feebly supported by the wishes of the good and the wise."

When James saw that lenience and toleration could not bring the ministers to his views, especially in respect to kneeling at the communion, and the religious observance of holidays, he grew implacable, and insisted that the laws should be fully carried into effect against them. This, as it turned out, only made matters worse. The *perfervidum ingenium*, or the dogged obstinacy of his countrymen, refused to accommodate itself to his wishes. On many occasions, great confusion arose in administering the Lord's Supper, some standing, some sitting, and others kneeling, when everything should have been conducted "de-

[1] Bishop Russell, in his History of the Church in Scotland.

cently and in order." The king was far more vexed about this than the bishops, who had often to interpose their good offices in favour of disobedient ministers, and get them confined within the limits of a certain district, when James would have had them shut up in prison, or deposed from their office. Spotswood himself declared, that the Church might do without the "articles" contended for; but as the king was peremptory, and the articles were lawful and praiseworthy in themselves, he thought it his duty to promote their adoption.[1] The enforcing of religion is one of the nicest and most difficult duties of a Christian magistrate. It requires caution, good temper, and prudence, to give no encouragement to error, and yet avoid all such compulsion as may invade the rights of conscience; for, as "false doctrine, heresy and schism" are the reproach of any people, so is also persecution on account of them. Laxity produces indifference or confusion; while zeal, combined with severity, is apt to engender obstinacy; and that again tends to rebellion, with all its disastrous consequences. Hence, Christian governments must sometimes connive at what they cannot approve; not so much because the offenders deserve toleration, as because it is so very hard to find out a remedy which is not as bad as the disease. In the case now under our review, the remedy which James and his successor Charles applied, failed in curing the disease; and posterity, which commonly judges by the event, has condemned them: but their situation was trying; and it is far from certain, that a different line of conduct would have been attended with more favourable results.

There were other elements at work which tended to bring about the impending catastrophe. Charles

[1] Calderwood, p. 737.

I., who had now succeeded to the throne of Great Britain, and was following up the system which his father had commenced, made Archbishop Spotswood and several of the bishops, his privy counsellors, with a view to make religion appear more respectable in the eyes of his northern subjects. This excited the jealousy of the nobles, who thought that all offices of rank and emolument ought to be given exclusively to their own order; and it stirred up the enmity of the Presbyterians, who could see in this worldly grandeur, only an approximation to Popery. But if the jealousy of the nobles was awakened, much more was their cupidity alarmed, by the measures which Charles pursued to recover for the Church some small portion of the revenues which had been sacrilegiously taken from it. For, having been accustomed, ever since the Reformation, to regard all ecclesiastical lands as their own, they considered the property about to be vested in the Church, as so much subtracted from themselves. They consented, however, upon certain conditions, but "grudgingly and of necessity," to surrender, from the Church lands and tithes which had fallen into their hands, certain annual feu-duties, and superiorities, as a permanent provision for the bishops and clergy.[1] The arrangement was thought equitable; yet neither the Church nor the aristocracy were content. The former was put off with a small fraction of the actual tithe, to the whole of which she had a just title; while the latter grumbled at being obliged to part

[1] The portion which fell to the bishops, lapsed to Government at the Revolution of 1688, (anything but a "glorious" Revolution for the Episcopal Church in Scotland,) and is now distinguished by the name of "Bishop's Rents." When at present so much is given to Roman Catholics and Dissenters, both at home and in the colonies, nothing would be more equitable than to bestow these "Rents" on the Church which once possessed them, now poor and wholly unendowed. Queen Anne, it has been said, intended to restore them, but was prevented by her premature death.

with what they were pleased to consider as their own. In this manner, covetousness, which we have seen was the cause of our *first* Reformation, was destined to become the cause of what has consistently enough been called, our *second*. Thus much is admitted by a Presbyterian historian of the period.[1] His words are remarkable: "With a view to coalesce with a powerful opposition party, they (the nobles) became the avowed champions of Presbytery; and from *pecuniary motives*, in their opposition to the bishops, *artfully laid the blame of every misfortune on Episcopacy*. By thus making religion a mere stalking-horse to their own interests, they verified the general remark, that at the bottom of the purest patriotism there often lies a thick sediment of gross selfishness." In short, the clergy declared that they would not have the bishops "to rule over them;" and the laity joined in the opposition, in order that "the inheritance might be theirs." But the latter, in the end, lost their own inheritance by sacrilegiously grasping at that of the church.[2]

Things were in this unsatisfactory state when Charles came to visit Scotland in the year 1633. On the 18th of June he was crowned by Archbishop Spotswood, assisted by five other Scottish bishops, in

[1] Aiton's Life of Henderson, p. 137.

[2] Principal Baillie, himself a refractory presbyter, thus speaks, in 1658, of the Scottish nobility, after nearly twenty years of rebellion which they were the first to get up against their lawful sovereign:—"The country lies quiet; it is exceeding poor; trade is nought; the English have all the money. Our noble families have almost all gone. Lennox has little in Scotland unsold. Hamilton's estate, except Arran and the barony of Hamilton, is sold. Argyll can scarce pay any little annual rent [interest] for seven or eight hundred thousand merks; and *he is no more drowned in debt than in public hatred, almost of all, both Scots and English.* The Gordons are gone. The Douglases are little better; Eglinton and Glencairn on the brink of breaking. Many of our chief families' estates are cracking; nor is there any appearance of any human relief for the time."—Vol. ii. p. 425.

the abbey church of Holyroodhouse. Archbishop Laud was also present, and directed the order of a ceremony which had not been witnessed in Scotland for many years before. On this solemn occasion, Spotswood addressed the king in these words:—"Sire, We also beseech you to grant and preserve unto us of the clergy, and to the churches committed to our charge, all canonical privileges; and that you will defend and protect us, as every good king ought in his kingdom to defend his bishops, and the churches under their government." The king answered:—"With a willing heart I grant the same, and promise to maintain you, and every one of you, with all the churches committed to your charges, in your hail rights and privileges, according to law and justice." *The king, rising from his chair, went to the communion table, where, in sight of all the people, laying his hands on the Bible, he took his oath, and said, "All the things which before I have promised, I shall observe and keep: So help me God, and by the contents of this book."*[1]

This is a most memorable fact, and has not met with the attention it deserves. Here the king, of his own free mind, and with the full concurrence of his subjects and all concerned, came under a solemn obligation to uphold the Episcopal Church of Scotland. Yet it is well known, and we shall see soon, that in eight years from this time, he consented to its overthrow!—unwillingly, it is true, and in the hope of conciliating his subjects; but still he gave his sanction to its abolition; and in so doing, *violated his coronation oath.* In other words, he committed a positive crime, in the vain hope of effecting an uncertain advantage: he did evil, that good might come. I have no doubt that this offence against God and his

[1] See a full account of King Charles's coronation in Sir J. Balfour's Annals, vol. iv. p. 393, &c.

conscience, was the cause of all his future misfortunes. There has been a difference of opinion, even among his friends, as to the precise point where he ought to have taken his stand, in resisting the gradual encroachments of his subjects. Here, I assert, was the point; a point from which he should never have receded one step. Had he been firm here, things might have taken a more favourable turn. It is at least certain that they could not have taken a worse turn than they did; and though some might have censured him for obstinacy or bigotry, the wise and good of that and all following ages, would have applauded him; and what is more, his own conscience would have acquitted him. He should have said boldly to the Scottish rebels in 1639, "Here have I planted my foot,—do your worst, —I will adhere to my oath, be the consequences what they may. If you are determined to have Presbyterianism, I cannot hinder you; but never will I give my sanction to a system which I condemn, nor break an oath which I solemnly took before God and yourselves." This would have been a highly honourable, and truly Christian line of conduct. But what did he do? He followed the pernicious advice of those who recommended him to temporize and concede; and what was the consequence? He was betrayed and murdered. Like Saul, "he feared the people, and obeyed their voice," instead of obeying God; and, like him too, he was punished by the loss of his kingdom. At the same time, it is no more than justice to Charles' memory to add, that during the rest of his unhappy life, he sincerely repented of what he had done; and when a prisoner in the isle of Wight, he told the Bishop of Lincoln, that "his consent to Strafford's death, and his abolition of Episcopacy in Scotland, had always given him great grief;" adding that, "if God should ever restore him to the peaceable possession of his throne,

he would demonstrate his repentance by a public confession, and a voluntary penance." But, to return.

On the occasion of Charles' visit to Scotland he erected Edinburgh into a separate see, thus completing the number of the Scottish dioceses to fourteen.[1] He annexed to it the whole of that part of the diocese of St Andrews which lay south of the Forth; or, as it is expressed in the charter of erection, "the sheriffdoms of Edinburgh, Linlithgow, Stirling, and Berwick, the constabulary of Haddington, and baillerie of Lauderdale." Edinburgh was raised to the rank of a city; and St Giles' church was named as the bishop's cathedral, with a chapter consisting of a dean and twelve of the ministers of the town and neighbourhood. And as, in consequence of these changes, the diocese of St Andrews was not only abridged of its patronage, but curtailed of its revenue, the king bought the priory of St Andrews from the Duke of Lennox, and annexed it to the metropolitan see. But from this source Spotswood derived little benefit; as the duke had taken the precaution to let his tithes on long leases and for small returns, in consideration of heavy fines which he had received from his tenants. In the archbishop's new charter, a wise provision was made,

[1] Galloway and Glasgow, erected about the sixth century.
St Andrews, ... by Kenneth II.
Aberdeen, ... by Malcolm II.
Moray and Caithness, . . by Malcolm III.
Ross, Brechin, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, . . } by David I.
Argyll, ... by William.
The Isles, ... by Alexander III.
Orkney, ... by James III.
Edinburgh, ... by Charles I.

It is painful to think how little the sovereigns of Great Britain have done for the church since the days of Charles I., compared with what most of them did for it down to his time. Indeed it would be easier to tell what they have taken from it than what they have given to it, notwithstanding the incalculable loss it had already sustained at the Reformation.

that all the annual income which should exceed 10,000 marks, was to be set apart for rebuilding the cathedral church. Trustees were appointed for carrying this regulation into effect; but the rebellion which was at hand, put an end to this and other salutary measures which were in contemplation.

In 1635, Spotswood was made Chancellor of Scotland, on the death of Lord Kinnoul. This increased the jealousy of the nobles, who were averse to see a churchman holding an office which they thought should have been given to one of themselves. But they ought to have remembered, that for many centuries together, the Chancellorship of Scotland was held almost exclusively by churchmen. They might have been satisfied with what they had gained in a pecuniary view by the Reformation, without grudging the church her very few remaining privileges.

We come now to the tumultuous rejection of the Liturgy, which would rather belong to a history of Edinburgh than of St Andrews, were it not that Archbishop Spotswood was present, and endeavoured, though to no purpose, to allay "the madness of the people." King Charles, and Archbishop Laud, it is well known, wished the Scottish bishops to adopt the English Liturgy without any alteration whatever, which is at least a proof that these two personages had no thoughts of introducing *Popery*, as has ignorantly or maliciously been alleged. The latter, it is true, was an enemy to Puritanism; but he was no less hostile to Popery, as he proved by his answer to Fisher the Jesuit; one of the ablest attacks upon the errors of the Church of Rome which has ever appeared in our language. But the Scottish bishops themselves wished a few deviations from the English Liturgy, lest their countrymen should take alarm at the idea of their church being in any way dependent

on that of England. A few unimportant changes were accordingly made; and the rule observed in making them was, to bring the new Liturgy to a nearer conformity with the primitive ones, which were in use throughout Christendom before the papal corruptions had commenced. The daily and Sunday services were unaltered; and the principal change was in the communion office, which is almost *verbatim* that of the reformed Liturgy of Edward VI., and is allowed to be preferable to the present one, which was deteriorated to please the fastidious taste of the English dissenters in the reign of James VI. The late Bishop Horsley said of the Scottish communion office, that "he had no scruple in declaring that he thought it more conformable to the primitive models, and, in his private judgment, more edifying, than the English office now in use; insomuch that if he were at liberty to follow his own judgment, he would himself use the Scotch office in preference."[1] But the anti-Episcopal party were determined at all hazards, for reasons which will be stated presently, to get rid of this obnoxious Liturgy; and hence they artfully raised the cry of "Popery" against it.

The royal proclamation directed that the new Liturgy should be used in all the churches of Edinburgh on Easter day, 1637; but owing to some

[1] Skinner's Annals of Scottish Episcopacy, p. 439. The late Mr Alexander Knox gives a similar preference to the communion office in the Liturgy of Edward VI. over the present one.—Vol. iii. p. 64. It is a curious fact that the Presbyterian standards actually come *nearer* to the language of transubstantiation than either the English or Scottish communion offices; as any one may see who will compare them with the "Confession of Faith," chap. xxix. sec. 5; the "Larger Catechism," questions 168, 170; the "Shorter Catechism," question 96; and the chapter on the Lord's Supper in the "Directory." In 1637, the Scottish office was of a less Catholic character, and therefore less liable to puritanical objection, than it is now, having been altered in A.D. 1765.

unforeseen delay, this was not carried into effect till the 23d of July following. Meanwhile, the leaders of the puritanical democracy had been moving heaven and earth to throw obstacles in the way of its reception; and concerted their measures so skilfully, that success was almost certain to attend them. Messrs Henderson, Dickson, and Cant, Lord Balmerino, Sir Thomas Hope, and Johnston of Warriston, held a private meeting in Edinburgh with "certain matrons and serving women." These last were instructed to "give the first affront to the book, and were assured that *men* would afterwards take the business out of their hands." Having thus laid the train, they withdrew to a convenient distance to await the explosion. When the Sunday came, and the Dean of Edinburgh had proceeded but a few minutes with the service, he was suddenly saluted by the "matrons and serving women" with such indecent and abusive epithets as "ye devil's gett!" [child], and "ane of a witch's breeding." After numerous expressions of this kind had been poured forth, a woman named Janet Geddes, hearing the dean announce the Collect for the day, exclaimed, "Deil colic the wame [belly] o' ye!" and aimed at his head the small moveable folding-stool on which she had been sitting. A young man happening to respond the "Amen" somewhat audibly at the end of one of the prayers, a "matron" who sat near him, turned quickly round, and, after beating both his cheeks with the weight of her hands, thus shot forth the thunderbolt of her passion, "False thief! is there nae ither part of the kirk to sing your mass in, but ye maun sing it at my lug?" [ear]. In the midst of this tumult, Dr Lindsay the bishop of Edinburgh mounted the pulpit, and tried to recall the unruly mob to a sense of what was due to the holy place in which they were assembled; but his efforts

were fruitless. The Archbishop of St Andrews, in his capacity both of primate and chancellor, then rose up in his gallery, and attempted to address the people, but with as little success. At length the magistrates interfered, and eventually succeeded in clearing the cathedral of the rioters. But when the doors were closed, and the service had once more commenced, they attacked the windows with stones, and kept up such a loud and incessant howl around the walls, as effectually interrupted the devotions of the worshippers. After the service was over, the bishop had the utmost difficulty in reaching his home in safety, and could not have done so but that a nobleman gave him shelter in his carriage. A woman who was near him exclaimed, "Fy, if I could get the thrapple [windpipe] out of him;" to whom another responded, "Though ye got your desire, perchance anither waur nor him micht come in his room;" on which the first rejoined, "Na, na, after Cardinal Beaton was *stickit*, there never was anither cardinal in Scotland sinsyne [since]; and if that false Judas were now stickit, scarce ony ane durst hazard to come after him." Singular as it may seem, the contemporary but anonymous relater of these anecdotes tells them to the women's *praise*, and thus winds up his narrative:—"These speeches, I persuade myself, proceeded not from any particular revenge or inveterate malice which could be conceived against the bishop's person, *but only from a zeal to God's glory wherewith their heart was burnt up*." The character of these women was, no doubt, worthy of their cause; nor is other comment on their behaviour necessary, except what is expressed by Baillie himself, who, though their general vindicator, is honest enough at times to speak out his mind:—"I think," he says, "our people were possessed with a *bloody*

devil, far above anything I could have imagined, though the mass in Latin could have been presented."

And yet, in the face of these historical facts, it is constantly asserted, that the king tried to *force* the Liturgy on the people of Scotland. The truth is, the force used was in *opposing*, not in *imposing* it. And thus, to serve their own factious ends, the leaders of the puritanical movement inflicted an irreparable religious injury on the great bulk of their countrymen, in robbing them, perhaps for ever, of a form of prayer which was not only in exact conformity with what was used throughout the Church Catholic in the earliest age of Christianity, but is allowed to be the sublimest compilation that uninspired men ever framed for the performance of public worship, and, at the same time, the purest manual for the exercise of private devotion.

But it is not difficult to account for the rejection of the Liturgy. They who were in the practice of introducing politics and personalities into their prayers, could not relish to be tied down to any preconceived form whatever. They who held the Knoxian doctrine of "the sovereignty of the people," and never scrupled to conspire against their king, whenever they had a selfish object to gain by it, could not very consistently pray, "From all sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion, good Lord deliver us;" and that "they, and all the king's subjects, duly considering *whose* authority he had, might faithfully serve, honour, and *humbly obey* him." They who had renounced, or were preparing to renounce, the whole of the polity, and many of the doctrines of the Church Catholic, could not well pray to be delivered "from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism." And finally, they who had often denounced the commemoration of the birth, death, and ascension of their Saviour, and the other leading

events of the Christian year, as superstitious, naturally abhorred a Liturgy which required the religious observance of these holy seasons.

When the Presbyterians found that they had embarked in the cause of treason and rebellion, they were not scrupulous as to the means they chose to accomplish their ends. Their great object was to keep up the excitement they had already raised in the public mind. This they effected, partly by the pulpit harangues of the disaffected ministers. "From every pulpit," says the Presbyterian author of Henderson's Life, "the language of calm defiance was heard." The same end they advanced by means of their voluntary fast days, and prayer meetings, which they made far more numerous, as well as more stringent, than the ancient fasts and festivals of the Church; and which, under the pretence of humbling themselves before God for their sins, were embraced as occasions for stirring up the people against the king and Episcopacy; for they well knew that the most effectual method of gaining over the people to their side, was to call in the aid of religion—"Quoties vis fallere plebem, finge Deum."

The same object they farther promoted by means of a National Covenant which they caused to be drawn up, by which they bound the subscribers, by the most solemn obligation of religion, to persevere at all hazards in the cause they had undertaken. I shall not describe the nature of this bond, farther than by quoting the remark of Dr Cook, the most candid of the Presbyterian historians, who says of it that, "it places beyond a doubt the determination of those by whom it was framed, to defy even the king himself, in attaining the object which it was meant to serve." Yet, such was the excited state of the country at the time, that it met with a reception beyond the most

sanguine hopes of its supporters; a circumstance which they did not scruple to ascribe to "a remarkable effusion of the Holy Spirit."! Nearly every nobleman in Scotland signed it; and the civil authorities in most of the great towns submitted to its requirements. Many, indeed most, of the clergy in the rural parishes and in the universities objected to it; but their objections were silenced by threats, or drowned by clamour. The Professors of St Andrews,[1] and Glasgow, published reasons against it; and at Aberdeen, it experienced so determined an opposition, that the sword of the Earl of Montrose, and the eloquence of Messrs Henderson, Cant, and Dickson, were put in requisition to bring the doctors of that learned university to reason; but with so little effect, that when they could neither subdue their courage, nor refute their arguments, they compelled them to quit the country, and seek refuge on the Continent. The three above-mentioned divines would have given up the loyal city to be sacked by the covenanting soldiery; but they were diverted from their savage purpose by Montrose, who was at this time beginning to discover the true character of the persons with whom he had incautiously connected himself.[2]

But the disaffected party discovered a still more efficient instrument for advancing their cause than even the covenant, namely, the calling of a General Assembly at Glasgow, to which they succeeded in obtaining the consent of their intimidated and wavering monarch, or, to speak more correctly, of the faithless counsellors by whom he was unfortunately surrounded. During the few months which elapsed preparatory to its meeting, they employed both artifice and menace

[1] See the reasons assigned by this university for refusing to sign it. Appendix XLVI.

[2] Baillie's Letters, and Napier's Life of Montrose.

to fill it with men, chiefly lay-elders, devoted to their views; many of whom, we are assured, could not *read*, but who were not, on that account, the less qualified to *vote* as they were bidden. They could not well avoid soliciting the coöperation of the bishops at their Assembly; but they took good care that they should find it more expedient to stay away. Of this we have a remarkable instance in the following letter written by an unknown hand, to Johnston of Warriston, Clerk-register, (one of the most unprincipled, but most influential leaders of the democratic party,) with a view to hinder Archbishop Spotswood from appearing at the Assembly. "Dear Christian Brother, and courageous Protestant; upon some rumour of the Prelate of St Andrews his coming over the water, and finding it altogether inconvenient that he, or any of that kind, should show themselves peaceably in public, some course was taken how he might be *entertained* in such places as he should come unto. We are now informed that he will not come, but that Brechin[1] is in Edinburgh or thereabout. It is the

[1] The Bishop of Brechin (Whytford) was at Glasgow at the time of the Assembly, and would have appeared before it to defend himself from the crimes of which he was accused; but the king's commissioner, who had by that time left the Assembly, would not allow him; lest his doing so should be taken for a recognition of its legality. But to give some stage effect to a charge of fornication which was brought against him, a woman and her natural child were introduced to the Assembly, of which child, the bishop was accused by the mother of being the father! "This," says Baillie, "made his adultery *very probable*." And the slanderous Rutherford, in his Lex Rex, (preface, p. 6,) speaks of "the adulteries of the popish prelate of Brechin, whose bastard came weeping to the Assembly of Glasgow in the arms of the whore." It was upon such evidence that the most virtuous prelates were condemned by this unrighteous Sanhedrim. James Gordon, parson of Rothiemay, says, that when this woman was afterwards asked, in the presence of six ministers, of whom the bishop was one, to point out him who had lain with her, the one she fixed on was *not* the bishop: and that she afterwards confessed that Lord Johnston had suborned her to accuse the Bishop of Brechin, whom she had never before so much as seen!—*Hist. of Scottish Affairs*, 1637—1641, vol. i. p. 100.

advice of your friends here, that, *in a private way*, some course may be taken *for his terror and disgrace*, if he offer to show himself in public. Think upon the best r—— by the advice of your friends there. I fear that their public appearance at Glasgow shall be prejudicial to our cause. We are going *to take order* with his chief supporters there, Gladstones, Scrymgeour, and Hallyburton. Wishing you both protection and direction *from your Master*, I continue your own whom ye know, G. 28th October, 1638."[1] Bishop Russell justly remarks on this letter, "What strange notions of justice and religion must these men have had, who, in advising schemes of violence, perhaps of assassination, could recommend one another to the direction and protection of God!"

Yet this Johnston, of whom we shall hear much worse things in the next chapter, was afterwards sent up, in the capacity of ruling elder, as one of the representatives of the Presbyterian Kirk, to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and is canonized among the "Scots Worthies."[2] G. (if it stand for the Rev. James Guthrie, as it probably does) is also a "Scots worthy." Both these men, it is well known, together with their coadjutor the Marquis of Argyll, another "worthy," were executed for high-treason after the Restoration, and their heads spiked over the West Bow of Edinburgh; the very spot where they had themselves, a few years before, assisted in fixing the heads of many brave and good royalists. Yet, according to Wodrow, they were "zealous Protestants, excellent patriots, and *martyrs*"!

[1] The original is in the Advocates' Library.

[2] Sir John Scott, who was his contemporary, accuses him of making a traffic of the official situations which were at his disposal, and of acting on the principle, "Qui ad honores juridicos pretio perveniunt, pretio etiam eos vendere oportet."—Staggering State, pp. 126, 127.

I cannot avoid here remarking, that the book entitled "Scots Worthies," with its Appendix, "God's justice exemplified in his judgments upon persecutors," is perhaps, without exception, the most atrocious in the English, or any other language. Under the guise of ultra-piety, it abounds with the foulest calumnies, the most scandalous falsehoods, and the most impudent and wilful perversions of historical truth. No matter how detestable a man's character may have been, if he ranged himself on the side of puritanical democracy, he is magnified into a saint; and if he suffered the just punishment of his misdeeds, into a martyr. He is even made to utter *prophecies*, which were all in due time fulfilled, like the legendary saints of old who worked miracles at their pleasure: with this difference, that the miracles of the saints were always wrought for some beneficent purpose, whereas, the prophecies of the "worthies" were invariably denunciations of vengeance against their enemies; which denunciations are recklessly twisted into facts, in opposition to the most undoubted historical testimony. In truth, a very large proportion of the "worthies" were actual murderers. On the other hand, if any gentleman had the misfortune to be an Episcopalian or a royalist, and much more if he were a Roman Catholic, however exemplary his conduct and humane his disposition, he is represented as an agent of the devil; there is no vice of which he is not capable, no villany of which he is not guilty; the misfortunes which befall him, are so many divine judgments for his sins; and, at the end of his unhappy career, he is consigned to "his own place" with manifest marks of gratification.[1]

[1] See the edition of 1775, reprinted in 1812. A grim, sour-visaged portrait of Archbishop Sharp is given by way of frontispiece. A new edition of the Scots Worthies is just now coming out, under the patronage of the dominant party of the Kirk, embellished with cuts representing the sufferings of the *martyrs!* O tempora!

The Scottish bishops were forbidden by the king to be present at the Glasgow Assembly; and, seeing how matters were tending, they readily acquiesced in his wish; but they drew up, and sent to it, a long and able protest, asserting the incompetency of an Assembly so constituted, and denying its right of jurisdiction.

END OF VOLUME FIRST.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by William Tait, 107, Prince's Street.

AUG 75